MIDEH/HONDURAS

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN
REVISED OCTOBER 2012

Submitted by:
American Institutes for Research

Contents

Acronyms

AMHON	Asociación de Municipios de Honduras (Association of Honduran Municipalities)
AOTR	Agreement Officer's Technical Representative
CETT	Center for Excellence in Teacher Training
COMDE	Consejo Municipal de Desarrollo Educativo (Municipal Councils for Educational Development)
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DCNB	Diseño Curricular Nacional Básico (National Curriculum)
DQA	Data Quality Assessment
EFA-FTI	Education for All-Fast Track Initiative
EQUIP	Educational Quality Improvement Program
GOH	Government of Honduras
INE	Instituto Nacional de Estadística
INICE	Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Capacitación Educativa (National Institute for Educational Research and Training)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MERECE	Education Donors Coordinating Table
MIDEH	Mejorando el Impacto al Desempeño Estudiantil de Honduras (Honduras Improving Student Achievement Project)
MOE	Ministry of Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PEME	Municipal Strategic Plan for Education
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
POA	Annual Operating Plan
SE	Secretariat of Education
SE/DIGECE	Secretariat of Education/Directorate for Evaluation of Education Quality
UNAH	Honduras National Autonomous University
UPN/UMCE	National Pedagogical University/Education Quality Measurement Unit

Introduction

MIDEH Project 2011-2016 builds on the achievements of USAID-funded EQUIP1-MIDEH/AIR program implemented in collaboration with the Government of Honduras (GOH) and Secretariat of Education (SE) to improve the quality of education through standards-based reforms and establishment of an education assessment and measurement system. MIDEH Project activities support Honduran efforts in pursuit of Education for All-Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI) goals.

MIDEH project activities are structured to achieve three results. Result 1 comprises the consolidation and implementation of National Basic Curriculum (DCNB) standards, corresponding instructional materials, and the assessment system needed to reliably measure and improve student achievement. Result 2 aims to build the necessary national capacity, leadership and ownership to sustain the standards-based reforms and improve quality of education. Result 3 constitutes engagement with civil society to promote implementation and utilization of DCNB standards and assessment results at the local level. A field research and investigation component complements these three project Results.

MIDEH Project's performance monitoring system is designed to measure the changes registered in student academic performance and education evaluation systems using selected indicators to determine the effect of the project activities overtime.

MIDEH Project activities aim to change the way that national and local governments, communities, civil society, educators, and families act in light of emerging opportunities in the environment to improve the quality of education in Honduras. The combination of recent legislation favoring decentralization of education services, and the firm rooting of standard-based reforms, means that the conditions now exist to improve instructional practices, increase teacher/school/system accountability and make better decisions regarding education policies based on reliable education assessment data.

The Project's approach to monitoring performance complies with the USAID/Honduras Mission Results Framework, obligations under the Cooperative Agreement, and AIR's institutional commitment to contribute to the knowledge base for development. Thus, our monitoring activities respond to the need to:

- Analyze and report MIDEH Project's contribution to achieving the Assistance Objective, including progress on results indicators at the Sub-Intermediate Result level
- Fulfill the obligation under the Cooperative Agreement to monitor progress towards EFA-FTI goals which are tracked as context indicators though not directly attributable to the project
- Monitor the activities for which gender is a significant factor
- Prepare timely information for MIDEH Project management to support decision-making and resolve potential problems
- Validate MIDEH Project's model of implementation and best practices in standards-based reforms and assessment systems so to be able to disseminate and replicate best practices and research findings

When developing its PMP, MIDEH Project consulted with the AOTR before confirming which indicators were required from USAID/Honduras' education sector Assistance Objective Results Framework and from the USAID basic education "F" standard indicators revised in November 2011. MIDEH Project also reviewed the companion project EducAcción indicators to ensure consistency with its approach and to identify instances where double counting must be avoided. MIDEH Project proposes the inclusion of a limited number of project-specific custom indicators that will provide project managers and USAID with periodic information on progress towards targets.

MIDEH Project internal tracking of inputs and outputs of a lower order are not included in the PMP. For example, training of less than two days is recorded for project accounting and technical purposes but is not reported to USAID through the PMP.

Alignment with Assistance Objective and USAID Education Strategy Goal 1

MIDEH Project contributes to the Intermediate Result **IR 3.1: Improved Quality of Education Delivery Systems**, and the four Sub-Intermediate Results, IR 3.1.1- 3.1.4 of the USAID Honduras Mission's Assistance Objective **Better Educated People**. The project's Performance Monitoring Plan is aligned with the results framework for the Assistance Objective.

MIDEH results will contribute directly to Goal 1 of the global USAID Education Strategy for 2011-2015 through three supporting goal areas: (1.1) establish and enforce reading standards and the utilization of reading diagnostic tools on a continuous basis; (1.2) develop and use sound assessment tools to monitor student performance over time; and (1.3) strengthen community and education stakeholder access to and utilization of education data for local decision-making. Thus, as general rule, in the disaggregation of results contributing to USAID Education Strategy Goals for the purposes of the annual Mission Performance Plan and Report, MIDEH Project results can be attributed exclusively to Goal 1.

Performance Monitoring Plan

AIR places high value on the use of quality monitoring and performance data to make appropriate decisions and achieve desired program results. During the life of MIDEH Project 2011-2016, AIR will collect data on students' academic achievements and teacher, school, local government and community use of project developed materials and assessment results to improve the quality of education. These data will be used to monitor the pace of program implementation, and its desired impact on student academic performance, achievement of the EFA/FTI goals, and progress towards a sustainable, national-led education assessment and measurement system.

To report project progress to USAID, MIDEH Project staff has selected a set of key indicators which are contained in the Annex of Performance Monitoring Indicators. They include USAID "F" standard indicators as they relate to Goal 1 of the USAID Education Strategy 2011-2015,

USAID Honduras Assistance Objective Results Framework-level indicators which include national contextual indicators, and project level custom indicators.

Data on these indicators will be collected at regular intervals to be analyzed and used in making decisions on allocation of budget and technical resources and adjustment to program activities planning as well as reporting to USAID. MIDEH Project technical staff has received guidance regarding their responsibilities for accurate and reliable collection of data, requirements for auditable support documentation, and awareness of data quality standards. MIDEH Project and partner staff will keep detailed records at all project-sponsored events including NGO and COMDE activities, and attendance at trainings and workshops for teachers, school directors, and local community education promoters. MIDEH Project has a full-time professional dedicated to the M&E function who is directly supervised by the Chief of Party. Additionally, AIR has a Washington-based M&E specialist who will ensure aligned and complementary data collection activities by both the MIDEH Project and the EducAcción projects. The MIDEH Project M&E specialist is also be responsible for analyzing when gender factors are relevant to project activities and performance and for making recommendations to enhance results through gender integration.

MIDEH Project will be rigorous in verifying results data through a data quality assessment process before reporting to USAID. Official statistics such as student enrollment, dropout, and repetition will be obtained through analysis of UPEG data and compared to EFA or other authoritative government reports when available. Central and local GOH expenditures on educational assessments will be confirmed through a cross-check of statistics from the Finance Ministry, the Central Bank of Honduras, AMHON, COMDEs, INE and the SE. MIDEH Project staff coordinators for Civil Society Participation and Training will provide another level of data screening within MIDEH Project.

Results of classroom-administered standardized tests (diagnostic, formative, and summative) will be reported by teachers to school directors who report to district directors/heads of COMDEs then to be consolidated by SE/DIGECE and MIDEH Project for validation and analysis. MIDEH Project is developing low cost options for electronic scoring and reporting. Classroom diagnostic and formative tests results have generally been reliable when administered by an educator trained to use the MIDEH-developed DCNB support materials. End-of-grade test results are proven reliable when MIDEH Project or other competent entities have overseen the test process and scoring to guarantee their security and integrity. Future end of grade standardized test results may be centrally processed by the SE with MIDEH Project assistance, or might be processed at the local level with oversight from COMDEs or other community monitors.

MIDEH Project aims to move the GOH and SE from relying on the technically limited percentage grades for reporting student academic outcomes, to the use of performance standards which can serve to make a valid comparison of outcomes across test years and test instruments. MIDEH Project tests are equated so to eliminate the variable differences in the level of difficulty of one test format compared to another. For valid comparisons, the PMP performance rating indicator for student academic outcomes on standardized tests is defined in four categories: advanced, satisfactory, needs improvement and unsatisfactory. Performance standards

descriptors for these categories were validated among numerous Honduran educators and were published under the EQUIP1-MIDEH/AIR project. Thus, MIDEH Project targets for the PMP are expressed in terms of percentage of students achieving satisfactory or advanced ratings, not a percent grade score. Although performance results categories can be converted mathematically to a percent grade score using cutoff points for the test, the results could not be comparable across tests instruments or different testing periods with a high degree of confidence.

MIDEH Project will track certain contextual indicators within its PMP as requested by USAID but with a clear understanding that such do not describe effects or impacts of MIDEH Project activities alone. For example, it would not be possible to attribute changes in national repetition rates and dropout rates to MIDEH Project though it is plausible to attribute a limited part of the reduction in those rates to improvements in classroom instruction fostered by teachers' access to and use of DCNB materials. The justification for limited partial attribution will be made in the indicator reference sheet and the DQA as supported by research findings of the 2010/2011 MIDEH Project study on associated factors and strategies contributing to improved student academic performance. Similarly, an increase in the contextual indicator on the average number of school days in session could only partially be attributed to the combined effects of the MIDEH Project and other education projects.

Indicator Reference Sheets and Data Quality Assessments

With this revised submission MIDEH Project presents full Indicator Reference Sheets for every indicator in the PMP having received the AOR's concurrence in the selection of indicators proposed herein. Furthermore, accompanying this document are draft DQAs for 11 of 14 project indicators. The DQAs review data collection methods for each indicator and reviews the quality of information reported to USAID. Preliminary DQAs for the remaining three indicators will be submitted during the second trimester of 2013.

Indicator Reference Sheets and DQAs address questions of attribution and specific characteristics of the indicators and data as well as add more detail to the collection methods and means of verification.

Complementary Studies and Gender

Activities under the three MIDEH Project results areas will be complemented by a research component which provides for field investigations, analyses, and assessments on topics related to factors affecting student performance, including gender; education evaluation system sustainability; best practices for early grade reading success; and qualitative assessment of the participation of women and men in education policy decision-making at the local level, among others.

All people level MIDEH Project indicators provide sex-disaggregated data. In accordance with discussions held between MIDEH Project and the USAID staff, the project will include a gender sensitive qualitative indicator in the PMP which measures fathers' and mothers' participation in monitoring school and student performance. The baseline for this indicator will be established at

the end of the 2012 school year through application of a survey to a representative sample of parents. If the baseline study shows significant gender disparities, MIDEH Project will undertake actions to address the gender differences which have an impact on results.

While sex disaggregated indicators provide basic data to assess gender representativeness, MIDEH Project will carry out complementary studies which provide more in-depth analysis of gender factors in the project activities. For example, research on factors that impede boys' reading skills, particularly in the early grades, can inform the design of teacher training targeted to change classroom instruction to better address boys' lagging performance in Spanish. Or, a representative case study of a COMDE's access to and use of education evaluation information could be designed to capture gender roles and dynamics that influence the participation of women and men in making decisions on local education issues. If the research identifies barriers to equal participation of men and women on decision-making, then practical changes in MIDEH Project's approach would be made to mitigate the barriers.

In addition to topics with gender content, MIDEH Project will sponsor high quality technical research linked to core issues and challenges facing Honduran educators and policymakers. For example, topics could include: (1) investigation of home and school factors the affect student attendance and learning; (2) identification of leadership roles and characteristics of effective school directors measured against student performance on standardized tests; and (3) development of effective indicators for measuring and monitoring educational progress in Honduras within a national evaluation system. MIDEH Project will form a steering committee to propose topics for studies and assessments. The committee will include MIDEH Project's Deputy Chief of Party, the project AOR, and representatives from institutions such as SE/INICE, UPN/UMCE, and UNAH.

Lastly, given the constant changes in the Honduran political and economic environment affecting the education sector, MIDEH Project may need to periodically re-assess the critical assumptions underlying the project's design and implementation. If the project experiences shortfalls or over-achievement in project results, MIDEH Project will investigate the reasons why and share lessons learned with interested education sector stakeholders.

Annex 1: Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) Indicators

Assistance Objective 3: Better Educated People

Intermediate Result 3.1: Improved Quality of Educational Delivery Systems

Indicator 1	Proportion of students who, by the end of the primary cycle, are able to read and demonstrate understanding as defined by a country curriculum, standards or national experts (F Standard Indicator)
Definition	Proportion of students and learners who attain a country defined threshold indicative of reading comprehension at the end of the primary cycle, as defined through the national curriculum. MIDEH Project will measure the percentage of Honduran students tested in a representative sample who achieve "satisfactory" or above performance ratings on the end of sixth grade tests which are developed by MIDEH Project to ensure psychometric validity and administered by the SE. Performance ratings are defined in the Performance Standards for Grades 1-6 developed under EQUIP1-MIDEH/AIR. A description of these ratings can be found in the corresponding indicator within the PIRS. Numerator: number of students reading with comprehension at the end of 6th grade as demonstrated by achieving a rating of satisfactory or above. Denominator: Total number of students and learners who are tested at the end of the primary cycle (or non-formal equivalent).
Rationale	Test results are a direct measure of student progress and mastery of the curriculum. The SE reports student academic achievement, which they measure using the end of grade standardized tests developed by the MIDEH Project (which are aligned to the DCNB). The content standards, diagnostic tests, formative tests, monthly pacing guides, and end-of-grade tests were all developed by MIDEH Project and are part of a complete package meant to be perfectly aligned to the national curriculum. Test results will be disaggregated by sex to help identify any gender disparities. An increase in the percent of students achieving satisfactory and advanced ratings indicates reading comprehension and competency in curriculum standards at the end of the primary cycle.
Disaggregate	Sex
Performance Measure	Percentage
Means of Verification	Cross-check with previous SE National Evaluation reports to verify that results are consistent with national test performance trends; observation of test administration and scoring and random spot checks by school directors, MIDEH Project staff or COMDEs.
Data Source	Academic achievement for this indicator will be measured via 1) SE administered sample based end-of-grade tests, 2) SE administered census based end-of-grade tests, or 3) a proxy measure. End-of- grade tests developed by MIDEH Project for 2012 which will be administered by the SE to all students nationally, are equated to the end of grade tests which were developed by MIDEH Project and administered to a representative sample of students nationally in 2010. In the event that a competent authority does not administer end-of-grade tests (sample or census based) a proxy measure consisting of the aggregate scores of monthly formative tests from a national representative sample will be used to report under this indicator. According to experts, the cumulative score of at least 6 monthly formative tests is a valid proxy measure for student academic achievement. Reliability would require verification prior to reporting results.
Collection Method	In external end-of-grade tests, test administrators return the test booklet and answer sheets to be scored at a centralized location by SE/DIGECE with oversight from MIDEH Project. If the SE elects to carry out census based tests, scoring may be decentralized with results data rolled up from schools to districts to the SE/DIGECE. Reliability would have to be verified prior to reporting results. The baseline value for this indicator is derived from end-of-grade external tests managed by MIDEH Project in 2010. Equated census tests may alternate with external end-of-grade testing. When a proxy measure is used, monthly formative test results from a sample will be collected and scored by SE staff trained by MIDEH Project; or by an NGO, COMDE and community volunteers trained by the Project.

Baseline (2010)	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
23%	No tests	28%	34%	40%	45%

Indicator 2	Proportion of students who, by the end of the primary cycle, are able to perform math operations and demonstrate understanding as defined by a country curriculum, standards or national experts (Project Custom Indicator)
Definition	Proportion of students and learners who attain a country defined threshold indicative of math comprehension at the end of the primary cycle, as defined through the national curriculum. MIDEH Project will measure the percentage of Honduran students tested in a representative sample who achieve "satisfactory" or above performance ratings on the end of sixth grade tests which are developed by MIDEH Project to ensure psychometric validity and administered by the SE. Performance ratings are defined in the Performance Standards for Grades 1-6 developed under EQUIP1-MIDEH/AIR. A description of these ratings can be found in the corresponding indicator within the PIRS. Numerator: number of students able to perform math operations at the end of 6th grade as demonstrated by achieving a rating of satisfactory or above. Denominator: Total number of students and learners who are tested at the end of the primary cycle (or non-formal equivalent).
Rationale	Test results are a direct measure of student progress and mastery of the curriculum. The SE reports student academic achievement, which they measure using the end of grade standardized tests developed by MIDEH Project (which are aligned to the DCNB). The content standards, diagnostic tests, formative tests, monthly pacing guides, and end-of-grade tests were all developed by MIDEH Project and are part of a complete package meant to be perfectly aligned to the national curriculum. Test results will be disaggregated by sex to help identify any gender disparities. An increase in the percent of students achieving satisfactory and advanced ratings indicates mathematics comprehension and competency in curriculum standards at the end of the primary cycle.
Disaggregate	Sex
Performance Measure	Percentage
Means of Verification	Cross-check with previous SE National Evaluation reports to verify that results are consistent with national test performance trends; observation of test administration and scoring and random spot checks by school directors, MIDEH Project staff or COMDEs.
Data Source	Academic achievement for this indicator will be measured via 1) SE administered sample based end-of-grade tests, 2) SE administered census based end-of-grade tests, or 3) a proxy measure. End-of- grade tests developed by MIDEH Project for 2012 which will be administered by the SE to all students nationally, are equated to the end of grade tests which were developed by MIDEH Project and administered to a representative sample of students nationally in 2010. In the event that a competent authority does not administer end-of-grade tests (sample or census based) a proxy measure consisting of the aggregate scores of monthly formative tests from a national representative sample will be used to report under this indicator. According to experts, the cumulative score of at least 6 monthly formative tests is a valid proxy measure for student academic achievement. Reliability would require verification prior to reporting results.
Collection Method	In external end-of-grade tests, test administrators return the test booklet and answer sheets to be scored at a centralized location by SE/DIGECE with oversight from MIDEH Project. If the SE elects to carry out census based tests, scoring may be decentralized with results data rolled up from schools to districts to the SE/DIGECE. Reliability would have to be verified prior to reporting results. The baseline value for this indicator is derived from end-of-grade external tests managed by MIDEH Project in 2010. Equated census tests may alternate with external end-of-grade testing. When a proxy measure is used, monthly formative test results from a sample will be collected and scored by SE staff trained by MIDEH Project, or by NGO, COMDE and community volunteers trained by MIDEH Project.

Baseline (2010)	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
5%	No tests	12%	18%	24%	30%

Indicator 3	Percent of students achieving satisfactory or above ratings on standardized tests in Spanish and Math in Grades 1-6 (USAID/H Results Framework and Project Custom Indicator)
Definition	Percentage of students tested in a representative sample of schools and grades 1-6 achieving either "satisfactory" or above performance ratings on end of year standardized tests in Mathematics and Spanish, as defined in the SE/MIDEH Project Performance Standards for Grades 1-6. A description of these ratings can be found in the corresponding PIRS. <u>Numerator: number of students achieving satisfactory or above rating on standardized tests in grades 1-6.</u> <u>Denominator: total number of students taking standardized tests in grades 1-6.</u>
Rationale	The principal objective of the project is to improve student learning; test results are a direct measure of student progress and mastery of the curriculum. Test results will be disaggregated by sex to show the differential ratings for girls and boys which will help to identify any gender disparities though targets will not be disaggregated. An increase in the percent of students achieving satisfactory and advanced ratings indicates improved academic performance and competency in the curriculum standards.
Disaggregate	Grade, sex, subject, locality (urban, rural)
Performance Measure	Percentage
Means of Verification	Cross-check results with previous SE National Evaluation reports to verify that results are consistent with national test performance trends; observation of test administration and scoring and random spot checks by school directors, MIDEH Project staff or COMDEs.
Data Source	Academic achievement for this indicator will be measured via 1) SE administered sample based end-of-grade tests, 2) SE administered census based end-of-grade tests, or 3) a proxy measure. Test score results are centralized in SE/DIGECE with MIDEH Project technical assistance. End-of- grade tests developed by MIDEH Project for 2012 which will be administered by the SE to all students nationally, are equated to the end of grade tests which were developed by MIDEH Project and administered to a representative sample of students nationally in 2010. In the event end-of-grade tests (either sample or census based) are not carried out by a competent authority, a proxy measure consisting of the aggregate scores of monthly formative tests from a national representative sample will be used subject to the availability of funds. According to experts the cumulative score of at least 6 monthly formative tests is a valid proxy measure for student academic achievement. Reliability would require verification prior to reporting results.
Collection Method	In external end-of-grade tests, test administrators return the test booklet and answer sheets to be scored at a centralized location. SE/DIGECE will score the tests with oversight from MIDEH Project. If the SE elects to carry out census based tests, scoring may be decentralized with results data rolled up from schools to districts to the SE/DIGECE. Reliability would have to be verified prior to reporting results. The baseline values by grade and subject for this indicator are derived from end -of-grade external tests managed by MIDEH Project in 2010. Equated census tests may alternate with external end-of-grade testing. When a proxy measure is used, monthly formative test results from a sample will be collected and scored by SE staff trained by MIDEH Project, or by NGO, COMDE and community volunteers trained by MIDEH Project.

Baseline (2010)	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015

Grade 1
  Spanish: 45%
  Math: 66%
Grade 2
  Spanish: 39%
  Math: 37%
Grade 3
  Spanish: 23%
  Math: 27%
Grade 4
  Spanish: 42%
  Math: 23%
Grade 5
  Spanish: 49%
  Math: 7%
Grade 6
  Spanish: 23%
  Math: 5%
	No tests	Grade 1
		  Spanish: 51%
		  Math: 72%
		Grade 2
		  Spanish: 45%
		  Math: 43%
		Grade 3
		  Spanish: 29%
		  Math: 33%
		Grade 4
		  Spanish: 48%
		  Math: 29%
		Grade 5
		  Spanish: 55%
		  Math: 13%
		Grade 6
		  Spanish: 29%
		  Math: 11%
			Grade 1
			  Spanish: 54%
			  Math: 75%
			Grade 2
			  Spanish: 48%
			  Math: 46%
			Grade 3
			  Spanish: 32%
			  Math: 36%
			Grade 4
			  Spanish: 51%
			  Math: 32%
			Grade 5
			  Spanish: 58%
			  Math: 16%
			Grade 6
			  Spanish: 32%
			  Math: 14%
				Grade 1
				  Spanish: 57%
				  Math: 78%
				Grade 2
				  Spanish: 51%
				  Math: 49%
				Grade 3
				  Spanish: 35%
				  Math: 39%
				Grade 4
				  Spanish: 54%
				  Math: 35%
				Grade 5
				  Spanish: 61%
				  Math: 19%
				Grade 6
				  Spanish: 35%
				  Math: 17%
					Grade 1
					  Spanish: 60%
					  Math: 81%
					Grade 2
					  Spanish: 54%
					  Math: 52%
					Grade 3
					  Spanish: 38%
					  Math: 42%
					Grade 4
					  Spanish: 57%
					  Math: 38%
					Grade 5
					  Spanish: 64%
					  Math: 22%
					Grade 6
					  Spanish: 38%
					  Math: 20%

Sub-Intermediate Result 3.1.1 Improved Efficiency of Educational Delivery Systems

Indicator 4	National repetition rates for grades 1-6 (USAID/H Results Framework Indicator, Contextual Indicator)
Definition	The repetition rate identifies the percentage of primary school students that have repeated a primary school grade at the national level. At initial matriculation, the number of students who are repeating the same grade in which they were enrolled the prior year divided by the total number of students in that grade. Numerator: Number of students at national level that repeated a primary school grade (1-6). Denominator: Total number of primary school students at national level.
Rationale	Changes in repetition rates from grade to grade, combined with dropout rates (Indicator 5), measure the efficiency of the system and the cost required to produce a primary school graduate. Decreases in repetition rates will result in greater cost efficiency per student cohort. This is a contextual indicator and changes in repetition rates cannot be directly attributed to MIDEH Project actions though it would be plausible to link reduced repetition rates to improvements in the implementation of the DCNB and more effective instructional strategies adopted based on assessment results. Attribution will be addressed in the Indicator Reference Sheet and the DQA.
Disaggregate	Grade, sex, locality (urban/rural)
Performance Measure	Percentage
Means of Verification	Annual Plan EFA report should coincide with UPEG data. Crosscheck with data from EducAcción targeted municipalities and district reports.
Data Source	SE/UPEG is the official government source for educational statistics. UPEG publishes repetition data which has been rolled up from school to district to department to national consolidated statistics.
Collection Method	Data drawn from UPEG database with additional support information from UPEG staff at the central SE. The baseline is calendar year 2011; the value will be calculated once Plan EFA has issued its 2011 report. Year 1 and Year 4 are calendar year targets drawn from the Plan EFA planning documents. No intermediate targets are set for years 2 and 3 though data will be collected to measure progress towards the EFA 2015 goals.

Baseline (Pending EFA report)	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Grade 1	5.4%			4.0%	4.0%
Grade 2	3.5%			3.0%	3.0%
Grade 3	3.0%			2.0%	2.0%
Grade 4	2.1%			2.0%	2.0%
Grade 5	1.0%			1.0%	1.0%
Grade 6	1.0%			1.0%	1.0%

Indicator 5	National dropout rates for grades 1-6 (USAID/H Results Framework Indicator, Contextual Indicator)
Definition	The dropout rate is the proportion of primary school students that have dropped out of school in a specific school year at the national level. Number of dropouts divided by the total number of students in grades 1-6. Numerator: Number of students at national level that dropped out of a primary school grade (1-6). Denominator: Total number of primary school students at national level.
Rationale	Changes in dropout rates combined with repetition rates described above measures the efficiency of the system and the cost required to produce a primary school graduate. Decreases in these rates will result in greater cost efficiency per student cohort. This is a contextual indicator and changes in repetition rates cannot be directly attributed to MIDEH Project actions though it would be plausible to link reduced dropout rates to improvements in the implementation of the DCNB and more effective instructional strategies adopted based on assessment results. Attribution will be addressed in the Indicator Reference Sheet and the DQA.
Disaggregate	Grade, sex, locality (urban, rural)
Performance Measure	Percentage
Means of Verification	Annual EFA/SE report crosschecked with district reports
Data Source	SE/UPEG is the official government source for educational statistics. UPEG publishes dropout data which has been rolled up from school to district to department to national consolidated statistics.
Collection Method	Data drawn from UPEG database with additional support information from UPEG staff at the central SE. The baseline is calendar year 2011; the value will be calculated once Plan EFA has issued its 2011 report. Year 1 and Year 4 are calendar year targets are drawn from the Plan EFA planning documents. No intermediate targets are set for years 2 and 3 though data will be collected to measure progress towards the EFA 2015 goal (Year 4).

Baseline (2011)	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Pending EFA report	0.6%			0%	0%

Indicator 6	National Average Number of School Days in Session (USAID/H Results Framework Indicator, Contextual Indicator)				
Definition	The national average number of days that learners are taught for a minimum of 4 hours in the classroom during the school year.				
Rationale	A reduction in school days in all probability will reduce the ability to cover all the contents and activities of the curriculum and result in low student academic performance. Attribution to MIDEH Project is limited to the impact of MIDEH Project's support and engagement with local civil society groups, NGOs, and COMDEs that are active in monitoring and demanding higher quality education services in their communities.				
Disaggregate	School level (primary, secondary), locality (urban, rural)				
Performance Measure	Number				
Means of Verification	Crosscheck data from EducAcción targeted municipalities and average with data gathered through independent reports from NGOs, COMDEs and parents associations. MIDEH Project technical staff to spot check accuracy through targeted interviews with parents and district directors in randomly selected schools and districts.				
Data Source	SE nationally reported statistics crosschecked with Transformemos Honduras (TH) and local affiliates, and other social auditing organizations to be determined.				
Collection Method	Collect and analyze data from NGO watchdog organization Transformemos Honduras. TH and other organizations will periodically report on a representative sample at municipal/district level that will allow the project to draw conclusions at a national level.				
Baseline (2010*)	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
158	165	175	182	192	200 days
* **http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2010/wha/154510.htm**					

Indicator 7	Annual GOH expenditures on standardized assessment of student academic performance (Project Custom Indicator)					
Definition	US Dollar equivalent value of annual GOH expenditures of national funds or donor funds to conduct standardized tests that evaluate student academic performance including diagnostic, formative, summative, end of grade, end of cycle, external and international standardized tests. Direct expenditures for test printing and the logistics of administration, test data collection and analysis, and results reporting will be counted. This indicator measures all GOH expenditure concerned with a national system of student academic performance assessment; it is not limited by the source of funds nor only to expenditures linked with MIDEH Project initiatives.					
Rationale	Student academic performance evaluations and measurement indicate changes in the quality and efficiency of education delivery systems. The amount of annual expenditures by the central GOH and municipal level governments for student academic performance assessments and measurement indicates GOH commitment to sustaining a national education evaluation system. An increasing proportion of the funding from national sources versus donor funding will further demonstrate sustainability as well as an increasing proportion from local governments compared to the central government.					
Disaggregate	Funds source (national, donor, central government, municipal government)					
Performance Measure	US Dollar					
Means of Verification	SE annual expenditure data will be cross checked with Ministry of Finance annual budget and expenditure reports, and against independent corroboration from MERECE members directly solicited by MIDEH Project. Local government expenditures will be verified through sampling of municipal and COMDE records during field visits by MIDEH Project and partner staff.					
Data Source	SE annual operating plans (POAs, in Spanish), budgets and expenditure data; SE program/project profiles and descriptions, published on SE website. Local government annual expenditure reports accessed through AMHON. The baseline year is the GOH fiscal year 2011 with a value of zero since the project and indicator are new. The projected results are based on various sequences of education assessment in which investment/activities are cyclical rather than straight-line. Since most evaluation expenditures occur in October/November, and MIDEH Project ends August 31, 2016, no target will be set for 2016.					
Collection Method	The GOH fiscal year coincides with the calendar year. For central government expenditures, MIDEH Project will collect fiscal year data from the SE website. Local government expenditure data will be collected by MIDEH Project or DIGECE liaisons with COMDEs and municipalities; liaisons could include EducAcción education facilitators, NGO sub-grantees, community volunteers, and other partners who will collect expenditure data at the time of assessments and record the data on a form supplied by MIDEH Project to be certified by a COMDE or municipal authority. MIDEH Project's COP and Civil Society Participation Coordinator will review all local government expenditure data before reporting to USAID.					
Baseline (2011)	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
---	---	---	---	---	---
N/A	$1.7 million	$1.3 million	$1.3 million	$1.7 million	No target

Indicator 8	Percent Capacity of a National Institution or Institutions to Manage a National Standards-based Education Evaluation System (Project Custom Indicator)
Definition	Demonstrated Honduran managerial, financial and technical capacity to carry out essential functions of a national standards-based education evaluation system. Capacity will be measured using a management assessment tool applied to the lead evaluation institution(s) starting six months after an independent institution is established or other existing institutions are designated for a lead role, but no later than March 2013. Capacity includes the presence of an appropriate institutional culture, professional management of operations and technical areas, financial planning and budget execution performance and institutional ability to manage change, among other factors.
Rationale	MIDEH Project capacities and products need to be transferred to a national institution over the next five years for the education evaluation system to be sustained under Honduran technical leadership and ownership. The target for capacity training is a proposed new independent education evaluation institute where staff capacity will be key for the sustainability of MIDEH Project interventions. MIDEH Project activities will continue to build technical capacity in SE/DIGECE and possibly in INICE, UPN/UMCE and UNAH, in the interim before the independent evaluation institute is established since it is likely that the independent institute will draw its staff from these entities.
Disaggregate	Institution, if more than one
Performance Measure	Percent
Means of Verification	The application of the assessment tool will provide an annual score expressed as an overall percentage change from a baseline which will be determined when the lead institution(s) is (are) identified and confirmed by a competent authority, e.g., the National Congress passes a law establishing an independent evaluation institute, or the SE declares an exclusive role for DIGECE. MIDEH Project experts and consultants will verify the accuracy of the score through personal observation during site visits and in joint working sessions during activity implementation.
Data Source	Management assessment tool scores and reports. MIDEH Project will determine the baseline value when the lead institution(s) to be assessed are identified and confirmed by a competent authority as noted above. It is expected that the lead institution(s) will be known by the end Year 1 of the project. When MIDEH Project has tailored the management assessment tool to the designate institution(s), the tool will be included in this PMP.
Collection Method	MIDEH Project will apply the management assessment tool annually to score Honduran capacity to perform key management operations and MIDEH Project technical functions independently with reduced external technical assistance and support. Data collection is likely to begin in Year 2 of the project.

Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Full capacity established in key functions (>85%)

Indicator 9	Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (F Standard Indicator)
Definition	Number education officials (public or private) or administrators of education programs, funds or institutions receiving training in aspects of their current positions, including areas such as management and quality assurance for improving reading skills at the primary level (Goal 1). Successful completion requires that trainees meet the completion requirements of the structured training program as defined by the program offered. Effectiveness is demonstrated with trainees successfully applying skills and knowledge in their workplace. Training should be at least two working days (16 hours in duration). When calculating the total numbers of officials/administrators trained, each person who completed the minimum number of training hours will be counted only once a calendar year. Trainees may benefit from USG-supported training for more than one calendar year therefore not all persons counted will necessarily be new for every year. Individuals trained will be disaggregated by sex and institutional affiliation (i.e. SE central departmental staff, principals, municipal, COMDEs and NGO/CSO administrators/officials).
Rationale	USG training supports capacity building for Honduran education administrators and officials and their institutions. This indicator provides an overall sense of the scope of the project's training activities by giving a count of the total number of administrators/officials trained for a minimum of two days equivalent in one year.
Disaggregate	Sex, institutional affiliation
Performance Measure	Number
Means of Verification	Require participants to sign-in to training sessions with full name and national ID number in order to verify daily attendance and avoid double counting individuals who receive more than 16 hours of training in a year. In addition, participants will undertake a post-training questionnaire to assess the effectiveness of training programs immediately after completing the full course.
Data Source	MIDEH Project, collaborating organizations, and/or contractors providing training.
Collection Method	Systematic collection of data via MIDEH Project records of administrators/officials trained, attendance sheets with personal information, institutional affiliation and contact information. All data collected via attendance sheets to be reviewed and certified by MIDEH Project's Training Coordinator.

Baseline	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
0	275	250	250	200	150

Sub-Intermediate Result 3.1.2   More Effective Teaching

Indicator 10	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who successfully complete in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support (F Standard Indicator)
Definition	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants (hereafter, teachers) who have successfully completed an in-service training program to teach in schools or equivalent non-school based settings with USG support. To be counted, trainees must receive at least 2 days (or 16 hours) total time in training. Effectiveness is demonstrated with trainees successfully applying skills and knowledge in their workplace. When calculating the total numbers of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained, each person who completed the minimum number of training hours will be counted only once a calendar year. Some trainees may benefit from USG-supported training in more than one calendar year. No long-term training is planned. All teachers reported here are direct beneficiaries under Goal 1 of the global USAID Education Strategy.
Rationale	Training teachers supports individual and institutional capacity building in Honduras. Effective teaching is a critical component of a quality educational system. Teachers will learn how to use DCNB support materials, create didactic plans and use the diagnostic, formative, and end of grade tests to improve instructional strategies and cover gaps in curriculum mastery.
Disaggregate	Sex
Performance Measure	Number
Means of Verification	Require participants to sign-in to training sessions with full name and national ID number in order to verify daily attendance and avoid double counting individuals who receive more than 16 hours of training in a year. In addition, participants will undertake a post-training questionnaire to assess the effectiveness of training programs immediately after completing the full course.
Data Source	MIDEH Project, partners and/or contractor training records. The baseline year is the year prior to the project start and the value is zero for a new program.
Collection Method	Systematic collection of data via MIDEH Project records of teachers trained, attendance sheets with personal data and contact information. All data collected via attendance sheets to be reviewed and certified by MIDEH Project's Training Coordinator.

Baseline	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
0	1350	1700	1700	1350	650

Indicator 11	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who successfully complete pre-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support (F Standard Indicator)
Definition	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants (hereafter, teachers) who have successfully completed a pre-service training program to teach in schools or equivalent non-school based settings with USG support. To be counted, trainees must receive at least 2 days (or 16 hours) total time in training. Effectiveness is demonstrated with trainees successfully applying skills and knowledge in their workplace. When calculating the total numbers of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained, each person who completed the minimum number of training hours will be counted only once a calendar year. Trainees may benefit from USG-supported training for more than one calendar year. No long-term training is planned. All teachers reported here are direct beneficiaries under Goal 1 of the global USAID Education Strategy.
Rationale	Training new teachers and educators supports individual and institutional capacity building in Honduras. Effective teaching is a critical component of a quality educational system. Teachers will learn how to use DCNB support materials, create didactic plans and use the diagnostic, formative, and end of grade tests to improve instructional strategies and cover gaps in curriculum mastery.
Disaggregate	Sex
Performance Measure	Number
Means of Verification	Require participants to sign-in to training sessions with full name and national ID number in order to verify daily attendance and avoid double counting individuals who receive more than 16 hours of training in a year. In addition, participants will undertake a post-training questionnaire to assess the effectiveness of training programs immediately after completing the full course.
Data Source	MIDEH Project, partners and/or contractor training records. The baseline year is the year prior to the project start and the value is zero for a new program.
Collection Method	Systematic collection of data via MIDEH Project records of teachers trained, attendance sheets with personal data and contact information. All data collected via attendance sheets to be reviewed and certified by MIDEH Project's Training Coordinator.

Baseline	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
0	400	800	800	800	400

Indicator 12	Percentage of teachers of grades 1-6 who use pacing guides, diagnostic and formative assessments (Project Custom Indicator)
Definition	Percentage of teachers from grades 1-6 who use the monthly pacing guides and diagnostic and formative assessments for Mathematics and Spanish subject areas as observed in a representative sample of teachers who have access to the DCNB classroom support package. This indicator does not measure the percentage of teachers who have access to materials, rather the percentage of the teachers who, having access, actually use three specific DCNB support tools: the monthly pacing guides which include content standards; diagnostic tests administered at the start of the school year; and monthly formative tests applied by the classroom teacher to monitor student progress. MIDEH Project cannot control teacher access to the materials since its scope of activities does not include production and distribution of DCNB materials. The sample of teachers observed will be representative at the municipal level to allow not only reporting at a national level but to report on subsets of specific municipalities to be defined at a later date. The instrument for measuring this indicator is currently being validated in partnership with EducAcción. Numerator: # of teachers observed using DCNB materials. Denominator: # of teachers observed
Rationale	Access to DCNB support materials is not a sufficient condition to improve teaching practices, quality of instruction and student academic outcomes; instead, effective use of the materials is necessary to achieve changes in student learning outcomes. Research on factors and strategies associated with student performance on end-of-grade standardized tests shows a positive relationship between student learning outcomes and teacher use of DCNB materials in the classroom.
Disaggregate	Grade (1-6)
Performance Measure	Percentage
Means of Verification	Observation checklists must be signed by the teacher observed and the person who conducted the observation. Spot checks will be made in selected schools and municipalities where MIDEH Project partners, including EducAcción, have a presence, in order to corroborate the results reported from the observers.
Data Source	MIDEH Project, collaborating organizations including EducAcción, and/or contractors implementing surveys. The baseline year has a value of zero since this is a new indicator.
Collection Method	Collection of data via MIDEH Project observation checklist is to be complemented by contracted formal studies for more in-depth analysis. Data collected via checklists will be reviewed and certified by MIDEH Project's Curriculum and Assessment Coordinator before reporting to USAID.

Baseline	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
0	70%	75%	85%	90%	95%

Sub-Intermediate Result 3.1.4 Increased Community Involvement

Indicator 13	Number of municipalities in which community, civil society and local government organizations use evaluation data for monitoring and decision-making (Project Custom Indicator)
Definition	Number of municipalities in which community, civil society and local government organizations use education evaluation data to monitor the quality of education services and to make decisions regarding education policies and services in their communities. Civil society and community organizations includes formal and informal groups, NGOs, parent associations, parent-teacher organizations, education advocates, private sector, teacher unions, and similar. Local government refers to any sub-national level of government but most particularly, municipal governments and COMDEs. "Use" for this indicator is defined as: 1) Education statistics and evaluation data being used in municipal and community level decision-making and plans. This will be evidenced by an annual review of municipal operating plans (POA), municipal education plans (PEME), and work-plans belonging to community and civil society organizations. 2) Civil society and local organizations use of education evaluation data in monitoring/evaluation procedures, lobbying/advocacy activities, or initiatives and projects aimed at promoting higher quality education. In order to confirm "use" organizations must present adequate proof (documents, reports, plans, policy proposals, etc.). 3) Education statistics and evaluation data are discussed and socialized during meetings, forums, and/or events, at community or municipal level.
Rationale	Equipping civil society and local governments to shape education strategies at the community level based on reliable education assessment data is a basic step to ensuring the sustainability of a national education evaluation system. Access to and use of assessment data helps to build a culture of decision-making based on objective information, and allows Honduran stakeholders to demand accountability and quality in the provision of educational services.
Disaggregate	Urban/rural.
Performance Measure	Number
Means of Verification	Field investigations/research studies will document how communities, civil society organizations and local governments are using education evaluation data to monitor the quality of education and to make decisions on education issues in selected communities. The studies will verify quantitative results from annual structured interviews conducted by MIDEH Project with the collaboration of its partners. Field investigations will also research women's and men's participation in and influence over community, CSOs, and local government decisions about education issues in order to identify gender based differences and changes over time. MIDEH Project staff site visit reports and event summaries will complement surveys and studies.
Data Source	MIDEH Project , partners and collaborators, and/or sub-grantees records, which document CSO, community, and local government leaders responses to questions in structured interviews conducted by MIDEH Project or its partners at least once a year. The baseline year is the year prior to the project start and the value is zero for a new program.
Collection Method	MIDEH Project and partners will administer a questionnaire to at least five leaders of different organizations in each municipality who are identified by their participation in COMDEs, municipal education committees, parents' associations or similar organizations which are active in monitoring public education services and quality. The interview instrument is attached.

Baseline	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
0	40	80	120	160	200

Indicator 14	Percentage of mothers and fathers surveyed who monitor school and student performance (Project Custom Indicator)
Definition	Proportion of a national representative sample of mothers and fathers surveyed who are active in monitoring school and individual student academic performance. Active monitoring includes use of parents' guide on content standards, knowledge of school grades and evaluations (including diagnostic and formative test results), participation in a parents association, attendance at school-sponsored events for parents such as socialization of tests results, among others. Parent monitoring will be measured through positive responses to at least four of seven simple yes/no questions posed orally by an interviewer to parents. Numerator: # of fathers and mothers surveyed who monitor school and student performance Denominator: total # of fathers and mothers surveyed
Rationale	Research on associated factors and strategies which impact student academic performance has demonstrated that Honduran student performance is positively influenced by parental interest and activism in monitoring both the school's and their children's performance. A higher percentage would indicate that parents are more likely to hold schools accountable for the quality of education services provided including compliance with a minimum of 200 class days per school year. Effective monitoring should involve both mothers and fathers.
Disaggregate	Sex
Performance Measure	Percentage
Means of Verification	Surveys conducted in a sample of schools will document to what extent mothers and fathers engage in monitoring school and students' performance. Analysis of the survey results will help identify any obstacles to engagement for both women and men.
Data Source	Annual survey of parents either carried out by MIDEH Project, partners, and collaborators, or by a Honduran consulting firm, in a sample of schools at the end of the school year. The baseline will be established with the first survey conducted in 2012. If gender disparities are evident in the analysis of the baseline data collected in 2012, targets will be set for female and male participation rates to measure the changing roles of mothers and fathers over time. MIDEH Project will adjust its activities to address the gender disparities (subject to USAID technical and budget approvals).
Collection Method	Annual collection of data at the end of the school year done by MIDEH Project staff or contractor through a structured survey in selected municipalities or communities where standardized test results are available (diagnostic, formative or end of grade). The survey questions will be posed by an interviewer orally to parents as they enter or exit from classrooms/schools on the day students grades are delivered. Responses will be recorded by the interviewer as "yes" or "no" for simple tabulation, and consolidated by MIDEH Project or the partner organization or contractor conducting the survey.

Baseline 2012 (TBD)	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Total Female Male	Total +5% Female (TBD) Male (TBD)	Total +5% Female (TBD) Male (TBD)	Total +5% Female (TBD) Male (TBD)	Total +5% Female (TBD) Male (TBD)	

Annex 2: Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS)

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 1
Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People
Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1 Improved Quality of Education
Name of Indicator: Proportion of students who, by the end of the primary cycle, are able to read and demonstrate understanding as defined by a country curriculum, standards or national experts   (F Standard Indicator)
Geographic Focus: Honduras
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Proportion of students and learners who attain a country defined threshold indicative of reading comprehension at the end of the primary cycle (6th grade), as defined through the national curriculum. MIDEH Project will measure the percentage of Honduran students tested in a representative sample who achieve "satisfactory" or above performance ratings on the end of sixth grade tests which are developed by MIDEH Project to ensure psychometric validity and administered by the SE.   Performance ratings are defined in the Performance Standards for Grades 1-6 developed under EQUIP1-MIDEH Project /AIR. There are four levels of performance ratings: a) Unsatisfactory, b) Needs improvement, c) Satisfactory, and d) Advanced.   **"Unsatisfactory"** performance is defined as: 1) The student displays limited understanding of the content material and has difficulties resolving simple problems. 2) The student demonstrates an achievement level that is **below the acceptable minimum** with regards to the curriculum standards. **"Needs Improvement"** performance is defined as: 1) The student displays a partial understanding of the content material and has the capacity to solve simple problems. 2) The student demonstrates an **acceptable minimum** level of achievement with regards to the curriculum standards. **"Satisfactory"** performance is defined as: 1) The student displays a good understanding of the content material and has the capacity to resolve a variety of problems. 2) The student demonstrates an **acceptable** level of achievement with regards to the curriculum standards. **"Advanced"** performance is defined as: 1) The student displays a superior understanding of the content material and has the capacity to solve intricate problems. 2) The student demonstrates a **high** level of achievement with regards to the curriculum standards.   This indicator will only measure the proportion of students obtaining "Satisfactory" or above performance ratings.   Numerator: number of students reading with comprehension at the **end of 6th grade** as demonstrated by achieving a rating of satisfactory or above on the end of cycle standardized tests.   Denominator: Total number of students and learners who are tested by MIDEH Project /AIR at the end of the primary cycle (or non-formal equivalent).
Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)
Method of Calculation: The number of 6th grade students achieving "Satisfactory" or above on the end of cycle standardized tests, divided by the total number of students who took the test.
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Test results are a direct measure of student progress and mastery of the curriculum. The SE reports student academic achievement measured by end-of-grade standardized tests which are aligned to the DCNB. Test results will be disaggregated by sex to help identify any gender disparities. An increase in the percent of students achieving satisfactory and advanced ratings indicates reading comprehension and competency in curriculum standards at the end of the primary cycle.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data collection method: In external end-of-grade tests, test administrators return the test booklet and answer sheets to be scored at a centralized location. Test administrators may include NGO personnel, Civil Society members, independent administrators, visiting teachers, and members of COMDEs, among others. MIDEH Project did all scoring for the 2010 external end-of-grade tests. It is expected that future external tests will be scored by SE/DIGECE with oversight from MIDEH Project. If the SE elects to carry out census based tests, scoring may be decentralized with results/data rolled up from schools to districts to the SE/DIGECE. Reliability would have to be verified prior to reporting results via random spot checks and cross checking with other national evaluation data. The baseline value for this indicator is derived from end-of-grade external tests managed by MIDEH Project in 2010. Equated census tests may alternate with sample based end-of-grade testing. If the GOH does not carry out end-of-grade testing a proxy measure consisting of the aggregate score of monthly formative tests from a **sample** will be used, subject to the availability of funds for data collection. When a proxy measure is used, monthly formative test results from a sample will be collected and scored by SE staff trained by MIDEH Project, or by NGO, COMDE and community volunteers trained by MIDEH Project.
The MIDEH Project has defined a sample of 384 schools representative at the national level and sample of 2,273 representatives at the municipal level, each with a 95% confidence level and a sampling error of 5%.
Data Source: Academic achievement for this indicator will be measured via 1) SE administered sample based end-of-grade tests, 2) SE administered census based end-of-grade tests, or 3) a proxy measure (see description below).
Test score results are centralized in SE/DIGECE with MIDEH Project technical assistance. The SE may choose to carry out census based tests for grade 6; these testes are designed by MIDEH Project and equated to sample based end-of-grade tests. In the event that a competent authority does not administer end-of-grade tests (sample or census based) a proxy measure consisting of the aggregate scores of monthly formative tests from a national representative sample (sample size is 384 schools) will be used subject to the availability of funds. According to experts the cumulative score of at least 6 monthly formative tests (there are a total of 8 monthly formative tests per year) is considered a valid proxy measure for student academic achievement. Reliability would be verified via a pilot study prior to implementation and reporting results.
Method of data acquisition by USAID: The SE will administer the tests and data will be available from the SE. MIDEH Project will obtain the information from the SE, and will disaggregate by sex for reporting to USAID.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually
Estimated cost of data acquisition: MIDEH Project provides technical assistance in the development of standardized tests. SE funds cover the costs related to the printing of tests, test administration, and data collection; Project funds cover the equating of census tests to sample-based tests.
Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist
Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project /SE files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): All tests used to measure academic achievement must be equated to MIDEH Project tests to ensure psychometric soundness. It is imperative that the SE works collaboratively with MIDEH Project to equate the tests. In addition, tests should not be administered or scored by individuals who possess a conflict of interest, for example: teachers administering and scoring tests to their own students. Without adequate security measures this could lead to compromised results.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Begin working with SE early to develop a plan for test equating. Cross-check with previous SE National Evaluation reports to verify that results are consistent with national test performance trends; observation of test administration and scoring and random spot checks by school directors, MIDEH Project staff/affiliates or COMDEs.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Data Analysis: Analyzed through comparison to baselines and targets, and considered in terms of implications towards project performance and achieving the assistance objective: e.g. are performance standards increasing or decreasing? Which departments and municipalities have the highest increase and why?
Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations showing targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above.

Review of Data: Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field and home office team and SE.	
Reporting of Data: Annually	

OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline is MIDEH Project 2010 tests; there were no tests in 2011. Prior to 2010 student's academic achievement was on the rise; however the political turmoil in 2009 caused test scores across the board to decrease. No tests were carried out in 2011. The initial increase in students obtaining "satisfactory" or above performance ratings for 2012 represents an expectation that some of the positive momentum that was lost during 2010 will be recovered in the first year of the project; thereafter a 4-5% increase will be the target for each year. National experts agree that this is an optimistic, yet achievable target.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2010	-	23%	Baseline score Source: Informe Nacional de Rendimiento Escolar 2010, pg. 21
2011	No tests		
2012	31%		
2013	35%		
2014	39%		
2015	44%		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 03/10/2012			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 2

Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People

Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1 Improved Quality of Education

Name of Indicator: Proportion of students who, by the end of the primary cycle, are able to perform math operations and demonstrate understanding as defined by a country curriculum, standards, or national experts. (Project Custom Indicator)

Geographic Focus: Honduras

Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Proportion of students and learners who attain a country defined threshold indicative of math comprehension at the end of the primary cycle, as defined through the national curriculum. MIDEH Project will measure the percentage of Honduran students tested in a representative sample who achieve "satisfactory" or above performance ratings on the end of sixth grade tests which are developed by MIDEH Project to ensure psychometric validity and administered by the SE. Performance ratings are defined in the performance standards for grades 1-6 developed under EQUIP1-MIDEH Project /AIR. There are four levels of performance ratings: a) Unsatisfactory, b) Needs improvement, c) Satisfactory, and d) Advanced.

"Unsatisfactory" performance is defined as: 1) The student displays limited understanding of the content material and has difficulties resolving simple problems. 2) The student demonstrates an achievement level that is **below the acceptable minimum** with regards to the curriculum standards.

"Needs Improvement" performance is defined as: 1) The student displays a partial understanding of the content material and has the capacity to solve simple problems. 2) The student demonstrates an acceptable minimum level of achievement with regards to the curriculum standards.

"Satisfactory" performance is defined as: 1) The student displays a good understanding of the content material and has the capacity to resolve a variety of problems. 2) The student demonstrates an acceptable level of achievement with regards to the curriculum standards.

"Advanced" performance is defined as: 1) The student displays a superior understanding of the content material and has the capacity to solve intricate problems. 2) The student demonstrates a high level of achievement with regards to the curriculum standards.

This indicator will only measure the proportion of students obtaining "Satisfactory" or above performance ratings.

Numerator: number of students able to perform math operations and the **end of 6th grade** as demonstrated by achieving a rating of satisfactory or above.

Denominator: Total number of students and learners who are tested at the end of the primary cycle (or non-formal equivalent).

Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)

Method of Calculation: The number of 6th grade students achieving "satisfactory" or above on the end of cycle standardized tests, divided by the total number of students who took the test.

Disaggregated by: Sex

Justification & Management Utility: Test results are a direct measure of student progress and mastery of the curriculum. The SE reports student academic achievement measured by end-of-grade standardized tests which are aligned to the DCNB. Test results will be disaggregated by sex to help identify any gender disparities. An increase in the percent of students achieving satisfactory and advanced rating indicates mathematics comprehension and competency in curriculum standards at the end of the primary cycle.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data collection method: In external end-of-grade tests, test administrators return the test booklet and answer sheets to be scored at a centralized location. Test administrators may include NGO personnel, Civil Society members, independent administrators, visiting teachers, and members of COMDEs, among others. Teachers will not be permitted to administer tests to their own students. MIDEH Project did all scoring for the 2010 external end-of-grade tests. It is expected that future external tests will be scored by SE/DIGECE with oversight from MIDEH Project. If the SE elects to carry out census based tests, scoring may be decentralized with results/data rolled up from schools to districts to the SE/DIGECE. Reliability would have to be verified prior to reporting results via random spot checks and cross checking with other national evaluation data. The baseline value for this indicator is derived from end-of-grade external tests managed by MIDEH Project in 2010. Equated census tests may alternate with sample based end-of-grade testing. If the GOH does not carry out end-of-grade testing a proxy measure

consisting of the aggregate score of monthly formative tests from a **sample** will be used, subject to the availability of funds for data collection. When a proxy measure is used, monthly formative test results from a sample will be collected and scored by SE staff trained by MIDEH Project, or by NGO, COMDE and community volunteers trained by MIDEH Project.

The MIDEH Project has defined a sample of 384 schools representative at the national level and sample of 2,273 representatives at the municipal level, each with a 95% confidence level and a sampling error of 5%.

Data Source: Academic achievement for this indicator will be measured via 1) SE administered sample based end-of-grade tests, 2) SE administered census based end-of-grade tests, or 3) a proxy measure (see description below).

Test score results are centralized in SE/DIGECE with MIDEH Project technical assistance. The SE may choose to carry out census based tests for grade 6; these testes are designed by MIDEH Project and equated to sample based end-of-grade tests. In the event that a competent authority does not administer end-of-grade tests (sample or census based) a proxy measure consisting of the aggregate scores of monthly formative tests from a national representative sample will be used subject to the availability of funds. According to experts the cumulative score of at least 6 monthly formative tests (there are a total of 8 monthly formative tests per year) is a valid proxy measure for student academic achievement. Reliability would be verified via a pilot study prior to implementation and reporting results.

Method of data acquisition by USAID: The SE will administer the tests and data will be available from the SE. MIDEH Project will obtain the information from the SE, and will disaggregate by sex for reporting to USAID.

Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually

Estimated cost of data acquisition: MIDEH Project provides technical assistance in the development of standardized tests. SE funds cover the costs related to the printing of tests, test administration, and data collection; Project funds cover the equating of census tests to sample-based tests.

Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)

Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist

Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project /SE files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):   Census tests must be equated to sample-based tests in order to ensure psychometric soundness. It is imperative that the SE works collaboratively with MIDEH Project to equate the tests. In addition, tests should not be administered or scored by individuals who possess a conflict of interest, for example: teachers administering and scoring tests to their own students. Without adequate security measures this could lead to compromised results.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Begin working with SE early to develop a plan for test equating. Cross-check with previous SE National Evaluation reports to verify that results are consistent with national test performance trends; observation of test administration and scoring and random spot checks by school directors, MIDEH Project staff or COMDEs.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Analyzed through comparison to baselines and targets, and considered in terms of implications towards project performance and achieving the assistance objective: e.g. are performance standards increasing or decreasing? Which regions have the highest increase?

Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above.

Review of Data: Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field and home office team and SE.

Reporting of Data: Annually

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline is MIDEH Project 2010 tests; there were no tests in 2011. Prior to 2010 student's academic achievement was on the rise; however the political turmoil in 2009 caused test scores across the board to decrease. No tests were carried out in 2011. The initial increase in students obtaining "satisfactory" or above performance ratings for 2012 represents an expectation that some of the positive momentum that was lost during 2010 will be recovered in the first year of the project; thereafter a 6% increase will be the target for each year. National experts agree that this is an optimistic, yet achievable target.

Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2010	-	5%	Baseline score: Source: Informe Nacional de Rendimiento Escolar 2010, pg. 21
2011	No tests		
2012	12%		
2013	18%		
2014	24%		
2015	30%		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 03/10/2012			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 3
Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People
Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1 Improved Quality of Education
Name of Indicator: Percent of students achieving satisfactory or above ratings on standardized tests in Spanish and Math in Grades 1-6 (USAID/H Results Framework and Project Custom Indicator)
Geographic Focus: Honduras
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Percentage of students tested in a representative sample of schools and grades 1-6 achieving either "satisfactory" or above performance ratings on end of year standardized tests in Mathematics and Spanish, as defined in the SE/MIDEH Project Performance Standards for Grades 1-6.   There are four levels of performance ratings: a) Unsatisfactory, b) Needs improvement, c) Satisfactory, and d) Advanced.

"Unsatisfactory" performance is defined as: 1) The student displays limited understanding of the content material and has difficulties resolving simple problems. 2) The student demonstrates an achievement level that is **below the acceptable minimum** with regards to the curriculum standards.

"Needs Improvement" performance is defined as: 1) The student displays a partial understanding of the content material and has the capacity to solve simple problems. 2) The student demonstrates an **acceptable minimum** level of achievement with regards to the curriculum standards.

"Satisfactory" performance is defined as: 1) The student displays a good understanding of the content material and has the capacity to resolve a variety of problems. 2) The student demonstrates an acceptable level of achievement with regards to the curriculum standards.

"Advanced" performance is defined as: 1) The student displays a superior understanding of the content material and has the capacity to solve intricate problems. 2) The student demonstrates a high level of achievement with regards to the curriculum standards.

Numerator: number of students achieving satisfactory or above rating on standardized tests in grades 1-6.

Denominator: total number of students taking standardized tests in grades 1-6.

Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)
Method of Calculation: The number of students (grades 1-6) achieving "satisfactory" or above on the end-of-year standardized tests in Mathematics and Spanish, divided by the total number of students who took the test.
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: The principal objective of the project is to improve student learning; test results are a direct measure of student progress and mastery of the curriculum. Test results will be disaggregated by sex to show the differential ratings for girls and boys which will help to identify any gender disparities though targets will not be disaggregated. An increase in the percent of students achieving satisfactory and advanced ratings indicates improved academic performance and competency in the curriculum standards.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data collection method: In external end-of-grade tests, test administrators return the test booklet and answer sheets to be scored at a centralized location. Test administrators may include NGO personnel, Civil Society members, independent administrators, visiting teachers, and members of COMDEs, among others. Teachers will not be permitted to administer tests to their own students.   MIDEH Project did all scoring for the 2010 external end-of-grade tests. It is expected that future external tests will be scored by SE/DIGECE with oversight from MIDEH Project. If the SE elects to carry out census based tests, scoring may be decentralized with results data rolled up from schools to districts to the SE/DIGECE. Reliability would have to be verified prior to reporting results. Equated census tests may alternate with external sample based end-of-grade testing. In the event end-of-grade tests (sample or census based) are not carried out a proxy measure will be used in which affiliates and/or students (under-graduates, post-graduates, and final year secondary school students) will be trained to collect data from schools. The MIDEH Project has defined a sample of 384 schools representative at the national level and sample of 2,273 representatives at the municipal level, each with a 95% confidence level and a sampling error of 5%.

Data Source: Academic achievement for this indicator will be measured via 1) SE administered sample based end-of-grade tests, 2) SE administered census based end-of-grade tests, or 3) a proxy measure (see description below).

Test score results are centralized in SE/DIGECE with MIDEH Project technical assistance. There is a possibility that the SE will choose to carry out census based tests in year 1 of the Project. These tests are designed by MIDEH Project and equated to sample based end-of-grade tests. In the event end-of-grade tests (either sample or census based) are not carried out a proxy measure consisting of the aggregate scores of monthly formative tests from a national representative sample (sample size is 2,182 schools) will be used, subject to the availability of funds for data collection. According to experts the cumulative score of at least 6 monthly formative tests (there are a total of 8 monthly formative tests per year) is a valid proxy measure for student academic achievement. Reliability would be verified via a pilot study prior to implementation and reporting results.

Method of data acquisition by USAID: The SE will administer the tests and data will be available from the SE. MIDEH Project will obtain the information from the SE, and will disaggregate by sex for reporting to USAID.

Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually

Estimated cost of data acquisition: MIDEH Project provides technical assistance in the development of standardized tests. SE funds cover the costs related to the printing of tests, test administration, and data collection; Project funds cover the equating of census tests to sample-based tests.

Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)

Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist

Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project /SE files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): These tests are to be equated to MIDEH Project tests to ensure psychometric soundness. It is imperative that the SE works collaboratively with MIDEH Project to equate the tests. Tests should not be administered or scored by individuals who possess a conflict of interest, for example: teachers administering and scoring tests corresponding to students they teach; this could lead to results being inaccurate.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Cross-check with latest SE National Evaluation reports to verify that school reported results on formative tests are consistent with national and departmental test performance trends; examination of teachers' classroom records, random spot checks by school directors, MIDEH Project staff or COMDEs.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Analyzed through comparison to baselines and targets, and considered in terms of implications towards project performance and achieving the assistance objective: e.g. are performance standards increasing or decreasing? Which regions have the highest increase and why?

Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation.

Review of Data: Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field office and home office team and SE.

Reporting of Data: Annually

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: The percentages below represent the percentage of students in grades 1-6 who achieved a "satisfactory" or above performance rating. The total average of students in grades 1-6 in 2010 obtaining satisfactory or above performance ratings in Spanish and Math on end-of-grade tests was 37% and 28% respectively; the targets below disaggregate by specific grades. Prior to 2010 student's academic achievement was on the rise; however the political turmoil in 2009 caused test scores across the board to decrease. No tests were carried out in 2011. The initial 6% increase in students obtaining "satisfactory" or above performance ratings for 2012 represents an expectation that some of the positive momentum that was lost during 2010 will be recovered in the first year of the project; thereafter a 3% increase will be the target for each year. National experts agree that this is an optimistic, yet achievable target.

Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2010		Grade 1: Spanish: 45% Math: 66% Grade 2: Spanish: 39% Math:37% Grade 3: Spanish: 23% Math:27% Grade 4: Spanish: 42% Math: 23% Grade 5: Spanish: 49% Math: 7% Grade 6: Spanish: 23% Math: 5%	Baseline score Source: Informe Nacional de Rendimiento Escolar 2010, pag 21
2011	No tests	-	-
2012	Grade 1 : Spanish: 51% Math: 72% Grade 2: Spanish: 45% Math: 43% Grade 3: Spanish: 29% Math: 33% Grade 4: Spanish: 48% Math: 29% Grade 5: Spanish: 55% Math: 13% Grade 6: Spanish: 29% Math: 11%		
2013	Grade 1: Spanish: 54% Math: 75% Grade 2: Spanish: 48% Math: 46% Grade 3: Spanish: 32% Math: 36% Grade 4: Spanish: 51% Math: 32% Grade 5: Spanish: 58% Math: 16% Grade 6: Spanish: 32% Math: 14%		
2014	Grade 1: Spanish: 57% Math: 78% Grade 2: Spanish: 51% Math: 49% Grade 3: Spanish: 35% Math: 39% Grade 4: Spanish: 54% Math: 35% Grade 5: Spanish: 61% Math: 19% Grade 6: Spanish: 35% Math: 17%		
2015	Grade 1: Spanish: 60% Math: 81% Grade 2: Spanish: 54% Math: 52% Grade 3: Spanish: 38% Math: 42% Grade 4: Spanish: 57% Math: 38% Grade 5: Spanish: 64% Math: 22% Grade 6: Spanish: 38% Math: 20%		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 03/10/2012			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 4
Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People
Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1 Improved Quality of Education
Name of Indicator: National repetition rates for grades 1-6 (USAID/H Results Framework Indicator, Contextual Indicator)
Geographic Focus: Honduras
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The repetition rate identifies the percentage of primary school (grade 1-6) students that have repeated a primary school grade at the national level. At initial matriculation, the number of students who are repeating the same grade in which they were enrolled the prior year divided by the total number of students in that grade.   Numerator: Number of students at national level that repeated a primary school grade (1-6).   Denominator: Total number of primary school students at national level.
Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)
Method of Calculation: The number of primary school students who are repeating the same grade, divided by the total number of students in that grade.
Disaggregated by: Grade, sex, locality (urban/rural)
Justification & Management Utility: Changes in repetition rates from grade to grade, combined with dropout rates (Indicator 5), measure the efficiency of the system and the cost required to produce a primary school graduate. Decreases in repetition rates will result in greater cost efficiency per student cohort. This is a contextual indicator and changes in repetition rates cannot be directly attributed to MIDEH Project actions though it would be plausible to link reduced repetition rates to improvements in the implementation of the DCNB and more effective instructional strategies adopted based on formative assessment results.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data collection method: Data drawn from UPEG database with additional support information from UPEG staff at the central SE.
Data Source: SE/UPEG is the official government source for educational statistics. UPEG publishes repetition data which has been rolled up from school to district to department to national consolidated statistics.
Method of data acquisition by USAID: MIDEH Project will analyze UPEG data, disaggregate it, and report to USAID.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually
Estimated cost of data acquisition: UPEG data is paid for by SE; MIDEH Project `s data analysis costs are covered by existing project resources.
Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist
Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project /SE files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The SE data does have measurement error; schools may have incentives to promote students who are not ready to be promoted (i.e. have better school statistics).
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Annual Plan EFA report should coincide with UPEG data. In addition, crosscheck with data from EducAcción targeted municipalities and district reports.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Data Analysis: N/A

Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above.

Review of Data: MIDEH Project M&E Specialists (Field office & Home office)

Reporting of Data: Annually

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline is calendar year 2011; the value will be calculated once Plan EFA has issued its 2011 report. Year 1 and Year 4 are calendar year targets drawn from the Plan EFA planning documents. No intermediate targets are set for years 2 and 3 though data will be collected to measure progress towards the EFA 2015 goals. Even though MIDEH Project will end in 2015 progress is expected to be maintained into 2016.

Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2012	Grade 1: 5.4% Grade 2: 3.5% Grade 3: 3.0% Grade 4: 2.1% Grade 5: 1.0% Grade 6: 1.0%		
2013	NA		
2014	NA		
2015	Grade 1: 4.0% Grade 2: 3.0% Grade 3: 2.0% Grade 4: 2.0% Grade 5: 1.0% Grade 6: 1.0%		
2016	Grade 1: 4.0% Grade 2: 3.0% Grade 3: 2.0% Grade 4: 2.0% Grade 5: 1.0% Grade 6: 1.0%		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 10/3/2012			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 5
Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People
Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1 Improved Quality of Education
Name of Indicator: Dropout rates for grades 1-6 (USAID/H Results Framework Indicator, Contextual Indicator)
Geographic Focus: Honduras
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The dropout rate is the proportion of primary school students (1-6) that drop out of school during a specific school year. Number of dropouts in grades 1-6 divided by the total number of students in grades 1-6
Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)
Method of Calculation: The proportion of primary school students that have dropped out of school in a specific school year, divided by the total number of students in grades 1-6, reported at the national level.
Disaggregated by: Grade, sex, locality (urban, rural)
Justification & Management Utility: Changes in dropout rates combined with repetition rates (indicator 4) measures the efficiency of the system and the cost required to produce a primary school graduate. Decreases in these rates will result in greater cost efficiency per student cohort. This is a contextual indicator and changes in repetition rates cannot be directly attributed to MIDEH Project actions. Though it would be plausible to link reduced dropout rates to improvements in the implementation of the DCNB and more effective instructional strategies adopted based on formative assessment results.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data collection method: Data drawn from UPEG database with additional support information from UPEG staff at the central SE.
Data Source: SE/UPEG is the official government source for educational statistics. UPEG publishes dropout data which has been rolled up from school to district to department to national consolidated statistics.
Method of data acquisition by USAID: MIDEH Project will analyze UPEG/SE data, disaggregate it, and report to USAID.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually
Estimated cost of data acquisition: UPEG data is paid for by SE; MIDEH Project `s data analysis costs are covered by existing project resources.
Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist
Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project /SE files.
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The SE data does have measurement error.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Crosscheck data with different sources of national statistics. In addition, crosscheck with data from EducAcción targeted municipalities and district reports.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Data Analysis: N/A
Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above.
Review of Data: Annual review by MIDEH Project M&E Specialists (Field office & Home office) **Reporting of Data:** Annually

	OTHER NOTES		
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline is calendar year 2011. Year 1 and Year 4 are calendar year targets are drawn from the Plan EFA planning documents. Year 2 and Year 3 are targets determined by MIDEH Project to facilitate measuring progress towards the EFA 2015 goal (Year 4). Even though MIDEH Project will end in 2015 progress is expected to be maintained into 2016.			
Other Notes:			
	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES		
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2011		1.2%	Baseline value obtained from 2012 SE database.
2012	0.6%		
2013	0.4%		
2014	0.2%		
2015	0.1%		
2016	0%		
	THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 03/10/2012		

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 6

Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People

Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1 Improved Quality of Education

Name of Indicator: Average Number of School Days in Session (USAID/H Results Framework Indicator, Contextual Indicator)

Geographic Focus: Honduras

Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): The national average number of days that learners are taught for a minimum of 4 hours in the classroom during the school year.

Unit of Measure: Number (#)

Method of Calculation: Aggregate number of school days for each school, divided by the total number of schools in the sample.

Disaggregated by: School level (primary, secondary), locality (urban, rural)

Justification & Management Utility: A reduction in school days will reduce teachers' ability to cover all the contents and activities of the curriculum and result in low student academic performance. Attribution to MIDEH Project is limited to the impact of MIDEH Project's support and engagement with local civil society groups, NGOs, and COMDEs that are active in monitoring and demanding higher quality education services in their communities.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data collection method: MIDEH Project will crosscheck SE data with information obtained from NGO watchdog organization Transformemos Honduras (TH). TH and other organizations will periodically report on a representative sample at municipal/district level that will allow the project to draw conclusions at a national level. TH plans to implement a system where groups of parents are used to collect data on number of school days in session. These individuals will monitor school days and forward data via mobile phones to a centralized location; this information will then be processed by TH`s technical team or affiliates and stored in a database.

Data Source: SE national statistics and data obtained from Transformemos Honduras, EducAcción, NGOs, COMDEs, and District Directors.

Method of data acquisition by USAID: USAID staff will be in regular contact with MIDEH Project `s Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and Chief of party. USAID will obtain data for this indicator from MIDEH Project.

Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annual

Estimated cost of data acquisition: UPEG data is paid for by SE; MIDEH Project `s data analysis costs are covered by existing project resources.

Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)

Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist

Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project /TH/SE files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Data is obtained via a secondary source therefore MIDEH Project has limited control over its quality and reliability.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Crosscheck data from EducAcción targeted municipalities and average with data gathered through independent reports from NGOs, COMDEs and parents associations. MIDEH Project technical staff to spot check accuracy through targeted interviews with parents and district directors in randomly selected schools and districts.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Analyzed through comparison to baselines and targets, and considered in terms of implications towards achieving the assistance objective, examination to determine whether national statistics coincide with reports from watchdog organizations.

Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation.

| | Review of Data: | Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field and home office team |
| Reporting of Data: | Annually |

Review of Data: Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field and home office team
Reporting of Data: Annually

OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets:			
Other Notes:			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2010		158*	Baseline score obtained from: http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/160459.pdf pg. 42
2012	165		No reliable data; MIDEH Project activities did not begin until 2012
2013	175		
2014	182		
2015	192		
2016	200 days		MIDEH Project ends 8/31/16; progress report will cover 8 months
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 03/10/2012			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 7

Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People

Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1 Improved Quality of Education

Name of Indicator: Annual GOH expenditures on standardized assessment of student academic performance (Project Custom Indicator)

Geographic Focus: Honduras

Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition US Dollar equivalent value of annual GOH expenditures of national funds or donor funds to conduct standardized tests that evaluate student academic performance including diagnostic, formative, summative, end of grade, end of cycle, external and international standardized tests (e.g. TIMMS, PISA, PIRLS, among others). In addition, direct expenditures for test printing and the logistics of administration, test data collection and analysis, and results reporting will also be counted. This indicator measures all GOH expenditure concerned with a national system of student academic performance assessment; it is not limited by the source of funds nor only to expenditures linked with MIDEH Project initiatives.

Unit of Measure: Amount in US Dollars ($)

Method of Calculation: Aggregate value of total expenditure

Disaggregated by: Funds source (national, donor, central government, municipal government), level of government (central, district, municipal, community).

Justification & Management Utility: Student academic performance evaluations and measures indicate changes in the quality and efficiency of education delivery systems. The amount of annual expenditures by the central GOH and municipal level governments for student academic performance assessments and measurement indicates GOH commitment to sustaining a national education evaluation system. An increasing proportion of the funding from national sources versus donor funding will further demonstrate sustainability as well as an increasing proportion from local governments compared to the central government. Furthermore, the GOH has the discretion to create EFA pooled funds expenditure plan. A GOH decision to expend funds for testing rather than expend funds for other purpose gives evidence of the strength of the GOH commitment to student performance evaluation.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data collection method: The GOH fiscal year coincides with the calendar year. For central government expenditures, MIDEH Project will collect fiscal year data from the SE website. Local government expenditure data will be collected by MIDEH Project or DIGECE liaisons with COMDEs and municipalities; liaisons could include EducAcción education facilitators, NGO sub-grantees, community volunteers, and other partners who will collect expenditure data at the time of assessments and record the data on a form supplied by MIDEH Project to be certified by a COMDE or municipal authority. MIDEH Project's COP and Civil Society Participation Coordinator will review all local government expenditure data before reporting to USAID.

Data Source: SE annual operating plans (POAs, in Spanish), budgets and expenditure data; SE program/project profiles and descriptions, published on SE website. Local government annual expenditure reports accessed through AMHON.

Method of data acquisition by USAID: USAID staff will be in regular contact with MIDEH Project `s Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and Chief of party. USAID will obtain data for this indicator in the Annual Report. Should publication be delayed USAID will receive the information directly from MIDEH Project.

Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: The financial year in Honduras coincides with the calendar year. Therefore this data will be available after December each year. MIDEH Project will collect the data once a year early in the calendar year.

Estimated cost of data acquisition: SE`s expenditures are freely available; existing project resources will be utilized to collect municipal level data in coordination with EducAcción.

Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)

Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist

Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project /SE files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Data is obtained via a secondary source therefore MIDEH Project has limited control over

its quality and reliability. This indicator may under-report the amount spent on assessments; some schools may be required to spend operational funds on reproducing exams, and those amounts will not be tracked centrally.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: SE annual expenditure data will be cross checked with Ministry of Finance annual budget and expenditure reports, and against independent corroboration from MERECE members directly solicited by MIDEH Project . Local government expenditures will be verified through sampling of municipal and COMDE records during field visits by MIDEH Project and partner staff.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Sum expenditures across all GOH – funded budgets. Disaggregate as noted above and considered in terms of implications towards achieving the assistance objective: e.g. what was the total amount of expenditure during the past year? What type of initiatives received the highest investment?

Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above.

Review of Data: Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field office and home office team

Reporting of Data: Annually

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline year is the GOH fiscal year 2011 with an unknown value. Targets are based on various sequences of education assessment in which investment/activities are cyclical rather than straight-line. Furthermore, since most evaluation expenditures occur in October/November, and MIDEH Project ends August 31, 2016, no target will be set for 2016.

Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2011		-	
2012	$1.7 million		
2013	$1.3 million		
2014	$1.3 million		
2015	$1.7 million		
2016	No target		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 3/10/2012			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 8
Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People
Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1 Improved Quality of Education
Name of Indicator: Percent Capacity of a National Institution or Institutions to Manage a National Standards-based Education Evaluation System (Project Custom Indicator).
Geographic Focus: Honduras
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Demonstrated Honduran managerial, financial and technical capacity to carry out essential functions of a national standards-based education evaluation system. Capacity will be measured using a management assessment tool applied to the lead evaluation institution(s) starting six months after an independent institution is established or other existing institutions (SE/DIGECE, UPN, and UNAH, among others) are designated for a lead role, but no later than March 2013. Capacity includes the presence of an appropriate institutional culture, professional management of operations and technical areas, financial planning and budget execution performance and institutional ability to manage change, among other factors.
Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)
Method of Calculation: Capacity will be measured using a management assessment tool applied to the lead evaluation institution(s) starting six months after the independent evaluation institute is established or other existing institutions are designated for a lead role in education evaluations. The assessment tool will measure institutional culture, professional capacity in general management and technical areas, financial planning and budget execution performance, and change management. The average capacity (percent) of institutional technical and management staff will be reported on an annual basis (out of 100%)
Disaggregated by: Institution, if more than one
Justification & Management Utility: MIDEH Project capacities and products need to be transferred to a national institution over the next five years for the education evaluation system to be sustained under Honduran technical leadership and ownership. The target for capacity training is a proposed new independent education evaluation institute where staff capacity will be key for the sustainability of MIDEH Project interventions. MIDEH Project activities will continue to build technical capacity in SE/DIGECE and possibly in INICE, UPN/UMCE and UNAN, in the interim before the independent evaluation institute is established since it is likely that the independent institute will draw its staff from these entities.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data collection method: MIDEH Project will apply the management assessment tool annually to score Honduran capacity to perform key management operations and MIDEH Project technical functions independently with reduced external technical assistance and support. Data collection is likely to begin in Year 2 of the project (Sept 2012 – August 2013).
Data Source: Management assessment tool scores and reports. MIDEH Project will determine the baseline value when the lead institution(s) to be assessed are identified and confirmed by a competent authority as noted above. It is expected that the lead institution(s) will be known by the end of Year 1 of the project.
Method of data acquisition by USAID: Quarterly and Annual reports will provide details on the instrument modification, administration, and data analysis procedures.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: TBD
Estimated cost of data acquisition: Cost will be covered by existing project resources.
Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist
Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: March 2013

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Measurement error associated with the instrument.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: The application of the assessment tool will provide an annual score expressed as an overall percentage change from a baseline which will be determined when the lead institution(s) is (are) identified and confirmed by a competent authority, e.g., the National Congress passes a law establishing an independent evaluation institute, or the SE declares an exclusive role for DIGECE. MIDEH Project experts and consultants will verify the accuracy of the score through personal observation during site visits and in joint working sessions during activity implementation. In addition measurement error will be reported with all results.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Data will be analyzed longitudinally by the corresponding individuals. **Presentation of Data:** Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above. **Review of Data:** Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field office and home office team **Reporting of Data:** Annually

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: TBD

Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	**Target**	**Actual**	**Notes**
1	TBD		Year 1 refers to MIDEH Project´s first year cycle (Sept. 1, 2011-August 31, 2012)
2	TBD		
3	TBD		
4	TBD		
5	Full capacity established in key functions (>85%)		

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 03/10/2012

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 9
Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People
Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1 Improved Quality of Education
Name of Indicator: Number of administrators and officials successfully trained with USG support (F Standard Indicator)
Geographic Focus: Honduras
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s):   Number education officials (public or private) or administrators of education programs, funds or institutions receiving training in aspects of their current positions, including areas such as management and quality assurance for improving reading skills at the primary level (Goal 1). Successful completion requires that trainees meet the completion requirements of the structured training program as defined by the program offered. Effectiveness is demonstrated with trainees successfully applying skills and knowledge in their workplace. Training should be at least two working days (16 hours in duration). When calculating the total numbers of officials/administrators trained, each person who completed the minimum number of training hours will be counted only once a year. Trainees may benefit from USG-supported training for more than one calendar year therefore not all persons counted will necessarily be new for every year Individuals trained will be disaggregated by sex and institutional affiliation (i.e. SE central departmental staff, principals, municipal, COMDEs and NGO/CSO administrators/officials).
Unit of Measure: Number (#)
Method of Calculation: Aggregate number of administrators and officials trained with USG support under the MIDEH Project.
Disaggregated by: Sex, institutional affiliation.
Justification & Management Utility: USG training supports capacity building for Honduran education administrators and officials and their institutions. This indicator provides an overall sense of the scope of the project's training activities by giving a count of the total number of administrators/officials trained for a minimum of two days equivalent in one year.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data collection method: Systematic collection of data via MIDEH Project records of administrators and officials trained attendance sheets with personal data and contact information. All data collected via attendance sheets to be reviewed and certified by MIDEH Project's Training Coordinator. In addition, participants will complete a pre and post survey to highlight the effectiveness of the training.
Data Source: MIDEH Project, collaborating organizations, and/or contractors providing training. Data for this indicator will be collected via sign-in sheets.   Surveys will take place once at the start of the training and a second time at the end of the training. Respondents will be asked to indicate the extent of their knowledge/understanding on several key criteria using the following scale :   1 = no understanding   2 = low level of understanding   3 = medium level of understanding   4 = high level of understanding
Method of data acquisition by USAID: MIDEH Project will collect and analyze quantitative data, disaggregate it, and report to USAID.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Quarterly and annually
Estimated cost of data acquisition: Costs are covered by existing project resources.
Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist
Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Data is quantitative and does not offer qualitative inferences.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Require participants to sign-in to training sessions with full name and national ID number in order to verify daily attendance and avoid double counting individuals who receive more than 16 hours of training in a year. In addition, participants will complete a post-training questionnaire to assess the effectiveness of training programs.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Data Analysis: Tabulate raw data and obtain the total aggregate number of administrators and officials who received capacity building training with USG support during each year. Analyze data via comparison to baselines and targets, and consider in terms of implications towards achieving the assistance objective. **Presentation of Data:** Data will be provided in a tabular format in quarterly and annual reports. **Review of Data:** Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field office and home office team **Reporting of Data:** Quarterly and annually

OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The targets for this indicator are moderate due to the difficulty in accessing the target population for an extended training period. Officials/administrators who completed the minimum number of training hours will be counted only once a year, however individuals could be counted again during subsequent years of the project. The baseline year is the year prior to the project start and the value is zero for a new program.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2011		0	Baseline
2012	275		
2013	250		
2014	250		
2015	200		
2016	150		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 3/10/2012			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 10
Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People
Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1.2 More Effective Teaching
Name of Indicator: Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who successfully complete in-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support (F Standard Indicator)
Geographic Focus: Honduras
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants (hereafter, teachers) who have successfully completed an in-service training program to teach in schools or equivalent non-school based settings with USG support. To be counted, trainees must receive at least 2 days (or 16 hours) total time in training. Effectiveness is demonstrated with trainees successfully applying skills and knowledge in their workplace. When calculating the total numbers of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained, each person who completed the minimum number of training hours will be counted only once a calendar year. Some trainees may benefit from USG-supported training in more than one calendar year. No long-term training is planned. All teachers reported here are direct beneficiaries under Goal 1 of the global USAID Education Strategy.
Unit of Measure: Number (#)
Method of Calculation: Aggregate number of teachers who received training with USG support under the MIDEH Project.
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Training teachers supports individual and institutional capacity building in Honduras. Effective teaching is a critical component of a quality educational system. Teachers will learn how to use DCNB support materials, create didactic plans and use the diagnostic, formative, and end-of-grade tests to improve instructional strategies and cover gaps in curriculum mastery.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data collection method: Systematic collection of data via MIDEH Project records of teachers trained, attendance sheets with personal data and contact information. All data collected via attendance sheets to be reviewed and certified by MIDEH Project's Training Coordinator.
Data Source: MIDEH Project, collaborating organizations, and/or contractors providing training. Data for this indicator will be collected via sign-in sheets and surveys. Surveys will take place once at the start of the training and a second time at the end of the training. Respondents will be asked to indicate the extent of their knowledge/understanding on several key criteria using the following scale: 1 = no understanding   2 = low level of understanding   3 = medium level of understanding   4 = high level of understanding
Method of data acquisition by USAID: MIDEH Project will collect and analyze data, disaggregate it, and report to USAID.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Quarterly and annually
Estimated cost of data acquisition: Costs are covered by existing project resources.
Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist
Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Data is highly quantitative and does not offer qualitative inferences.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Require participants to sign-in to training sessions with full name and national ID number in order to verify daily attendance and avoid double counting individuals who receive more than 16 hours of training in a year. In addition, participants will complete a post-training questionnaire to assess the effectiveness of training programs.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Tabulate raw data and obtain the total aggregate number of teachers who received capacity building training with USG support during each year. Analyze data via comparison to baselines and targets, and consider in terms of implications towards achieving the assistance objective.
Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above.
Review of Data: Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field and home office team
Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annually

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets are limited due to the fact that training can only be conducted during non-school days. The baseline year is the year prior to the project start and the value is zero for a new program.

Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2011		0	Baseline
2012	1350		
2013	1700		
2014	1700		
2015	1350		
2016	650		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 03/10/2012			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 11
Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People
Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1.2 More Effective Teaching
Name of Indicator: Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants who successfully complete pre-service training or received intensive coaching or mentoring with USG support (F Standard Indicator)
Geographic Focus: Honduras
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants (hereafter, teachers) who have successfully completed a pre-service training program to teach in schools or equivalent non-school based settings with USG support. To be counted, trainees must receive at least 2 days (or 16 hours) total time in training. Effectiveness is demonstrated with trainees successfully applying skills and knowledge in their workplace. When calculating the total numbers of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained, each person who completed the minimum number of training hours will be counted only once a calendar year. Trainees may benefit from USG-supported training for more than one calendar year. No long-term training is planned. All teachers reported here are direct beneficiaries under Goal 1 of the global USAID Education Strategy.
Unit of Measure: Number (#)
Method of Calculation: Aggregate number of teachers who received training with USG support under the MIDEH Project.
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Training new teachers and educators supports individual and institutional capacity building in Honduras. Effective teaching is a critical component of a quality educational system. Teachers will learn how to use DCNB support materials, create didactic plans and use the diagnostic, formative, and end-of-grade tests to improve instructional strategies and cover gaps in curriculum mastery.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data collection method: Systematic collection of data via MIDEH Project records of teachers trained, attendance sheets with personal data and contact information. All data collected via attendance sheets to be reviewed and certified by MIDEH Project's Training Coordinator.
Data Source: MIDEH Project, collaborating organizations, and/or contractors providing training. Data for this indicator will be collected via sign-in sheets and surveys. Surveys will take place once at the start of the training and a second time at the end of the training. Respondents will be asked to indicate the extent of their knowledge/understanding on several key criteria using the following scale: 1 = no understanding   2 = low level of understanding   3 = medium level of understanding   4 = high level of understanding
Method of data acquisition by USAID: MIDEH Project will collect and analyze data, disaggregate it, and report to USAID.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Quarterly and annually
Estimated cost of data acquisition: Costs are covered by existing project resources.
Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist
Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Data is highly quantitative and does not offer qualitative inferences.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Require participants to sign-in to training sessions with full name and national ID number in order to verify daily attendance and avoid double counting individuals who receive more than 16 hours of training in a year. In addition, participants will complete a post-training questionnaire to assess the effectiveness of training programs.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Data Analysis: Tabulate raw data and obtain the total aggregate number of teachers who received capacity building training with USG support during each year. Analyze data via comparison to baselines and targets, and consider in terms of implications towards achieving the assistance objective.   **Presentation of Data:** Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above.   **Review of Data:** Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field and home office team   **Reporting of Data:** Quarterly and Annually

OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline year is the year prior to the project start and the value is zero for a new program.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	**Target**	**Actual**	**Notes**
2011		0	Baseline
2012	400		
2013	800		
2014	800		
2015	800		
2016	700		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 03/10/2012			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 12
Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People
Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1.2 More Effective Teaching
Name of Indicator: Percentage of teachers of grades 1-6 who use pacing guides, diagnostic and formative assessments who are using the materials (Project Custom Indicator)
Geographic Focus: Honduras
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Percentage of teachers from grades 1-6 who use the monthly pacing guides and diagnostic and formative assessments for Mathematics and Spanish subject areas as observed in a representative sample of teachers who have access to the DCNB classroom support package. This indicator does not measure the percentage of teachers who have access to materials, rather the percentage of the teachers who, having access, actually use three specific DCNB support tools: the monthly pacing guides which include content standards; diagnostic tests administered at the start of the school year; and monthly formative tests applied by the classroom teacher to monitor student progress. MIDEH Project cannot control teacher access to the materials since its scope of activities does not include production and distribution of DCNB materials. The sample of teachers observed will be representative at the municipal level to allow not only reporting at a national level but to report on subsets of specific municipalities to be defined at a later date.

Numerator: # of teachers observed using DCNB materials.

Denominator: # of teachers observed

Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)
Method of Calculation: Number of observed teachers of grades 1-6 who use monthly pacing guides, diagnostic and formative assessments for Mathematics and Spanish subject areas, divided by total number of teachers observed.
Disaggregated by: Grade (1-6)
Justification & Management Utility: Access to DCNB support materials is not a sufficient condition to improve teaching practices, quality of instruction, and student academic outcomes, rather effective use of the materials is necessary to achieve changes in student learning outcomes. Research on factors and strategies associated with student performance on end-of-grade standardized tests shows a positive relationship between student learning outcomes and teacher use of DCNB materials in the classroom.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data collection method: Collection of data via MIDEH Project observation checklist is to be complemented by contracted formal studies for more in-depth analysis. Data collected via checklists will be reviewed and certified by MIDEH Project's Curriculum and Assessment Coordinator before reporting to USAID.
Data Source: MIDEH Project, collaborating organizations including EducAcción, and/or contractors implementing surveys.
Method of data acquisition by USAID: MIDEH Project, in partnership with EducAcción, will collect data, disaggregate it, and report to USAID.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually
Estimated cost of data acquisition: Costs are covered by existing project resources.
Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist
Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality July 2012

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Individuals will require training in order to determine whether teachers are using DCNB materials. The data collection instrument was made to be as simple as possible; however it is possible that results could be affected by some degree of subjectivity. However these are not expected to be statistically significant so as to skew the final outcomes.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Observation checklists must be signed by the teacher observed and the person who conducted the observation. Spot checks will be made in selected schools and municipalities where MIDEH Project partners, including EducAcción, have a presence, in order to corroborate the results reported from the observers.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Data Analysis: Analyze via comparison to baselines and targets, and considered in terms of implications towards project performance and achieving the assistance objective: e.g. is the use of materials aligned with the DCNB increasing or decreasing? Which regions display the highest/lowest increase and why?
Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above.
Review of Data: Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field and home office team.
Reporting of Data: Annually
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline year is the year prior to the project start and the value is zero for a new program.
Other Notes:

<div align="center">

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

</div>

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2011		0	Baseline
2012	70%		
2013	75%		
2014	85%		
2015	90%		
2016	95%		

<div align="center">**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:** 3/10/2012</div>

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Indicator #: 13
Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People
Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1.4 Increased Community Involvement
Name of Indicator: Number of municipalities in which community, civil society and local government organizations use evaluation data for monitoring and decision-making (Project Custom Indicator)
Geographic Focus: Honduras
Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Number of municipalities in which community, civil society and/or local government organizations use education evaluation data to monitor the quality of education services and to make decisions regarding education policies and services in their communities. Civil society and community organizations includes formal and informal groups, NGOs, parent associations, parent-teacher organizations, education advocates, private sector, teacher unions, and similar. Local government refers to any sub-national level of government but most particularly, municipal governments and COMDEs.
 	
"Use" for this indicator is defined as:
 	
    1) Education statistics and evaluation data being used in municipal and community level decision-making and plans. This will be evidenced by an annual review of municipal operating plans (POA), municipal education plans (PEME), and work-plans belonging to community and civil society organizations.
 	
    2) Civil society and local organizations use of education evaluation data in monitoring/evaluation procedures, lobbying/advocacy activities, or initiatives and projects aimed at promoting higher quality education. In order to confirm "use" organizations must present adequate proof (documents, reports, plans, policy proposals, etc.).
 	
    3) Education statistics and evaluation data are discussed and socialized during meetings, forums, and/or events, at community or municipal level.

Unit of Measure: Number (#)
Method of Calculation: Aggregate number of municipalities who use evaluation data for monitoring and decision-making.
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Equipping civil society and local governments to shape education strategies at the community level based on reliable education assessment data is a basic step to ensuring the sustainability of a national education evaluation system. Access to and use of assessment data helps to build a culture of decision-making based on objective information, and allows Honduran stakeholders to demand accountability and quality in the provision of educational services.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data collection method: MIDEH Project and partners will administer a questionnaire to a least five leaders of different organizations in each municipality who are identified by their participation in COMDEs, municipal education committees, parents' associations or similar organizations which are active in monitoring public education services and quality.
Data Source: MIDEH Project , partners and collaborators, and/or sub-grantees records, which document CSO, community, and local government leaders responses to questions in structured interviews conducted by MIDEH Project or its partners at least once a year. The baseline year is the year prior to the project start and the value is zero for a new program.
Method of data acquisition by USAID: MIDEH Project will collect data, disaggregate it, and report to USAID.
Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually
Estimated cost of data acquisition: Costs are covered by existing project resources.
Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)
Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist
Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project /SE files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012			
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Interviewees may have political reasons for exaggerating or omitting information.			
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Field investigations/research studies will document how communities, civil society organizations and local governments are using education evaluation data to monitor the quality of education and to make decisions on education issues in selected communities. The studies will verify quantitative results from annual structured interviews conducted by MIDEH Project with the collaboration of its partners. Field investigations will also research women's and men's participation in and influence over community, CSOs, and local government decisions about education issues in order to identify gender based differences and changes over time. MIDEH Project staff site visit reports and event summaries will complement surveys and studies.			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD			
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD			
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING			
Data Analysis: Analyze via comparison to baselines and targets, and considered in terms of implications towards achieving the assistance objective: e.g. Which municipal groups are using evaluation data? How is it being used?			
Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above.			
Review of Data: Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field office and home office team.			
Reporting of Data: Annually			
OTHER NOTES			
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline year is the year prior to the project start and the value is zero for a new program.			
Other Notes:			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2011		0	Baseline
2012	40		
2013	80		
2014	120		
2015	160		
2016	200		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 3/10/2012			

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Indicator #: 14

Name of Development Objective: Better Educated People

Name of Intermediate Result: 3.1.4 Increased Community Involvement

Name of Indicator: Percentage of mothers and fathers surveyed who monitor school and student performance (Project Custom Indicator)

Geographic Focus: Honduras

Is this an Annual Report indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Proportion of a representative sample of mothers and fathers surveyed who are active in monitoring school and individual student academic performance. Active monitoring includes use of parents' guide on content standards, knowledge of student performance, participation in a parents association, attendance at school-sponsored events for parents such as socialization of tests results, among others. Parent monitoring will be measured through positive responses to at least four of seven simple questions posed orally by an interviewer to parents when student grades are delivered at the end of the school year.

Numerator: # of fathers and mothers surveyed who monitor school and student performance

Denominator: total # of fathers and mothers surveyed

Unit of Measure: Percentage (%)

Method of Calculation: Number of mothers and fathers surveyed who are active in monitoring school and individual student academic performance, divided by total number of mothers and fathers surveyed.

Disaggregated by: Sex

Justification & Management Utility: Research on associated factors and strategies which impact student academic performance has demonstrated that Honduran student performance is positively influenced by parental interest and activism in monitoring both the school's and their children's performance. A higher incidence of parental involvement indicates schools' being held more accountable for the quality of education services provided including compliance with a minimum of 200 class days per school year. Effective monitoring should involve both mothers and fathers.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data collection method: Annual collection of data at the end of the school year done by MIDEH Project staff or contractor through a structured survey in selected municipalities or communities where standardized test results are available (diagnostic, formative or end-of-grade). The survey questions will be posed by an interviewer orally to randomly selected parents within target communities. Responses will be recorded by the interviewer as "yes" or "no" or level of frequency (i.e. "always", "most of the time", "sometimes", "never") for simple tabulation. This information will be consolidated by MIDEH Project or the partner organization or contractor conducting the survey.

Data Source: The annual survey of parents either carried out by MIDEH Project, partners, and collaborators, or by a Honduran consulting firm, in a sample of schools at the end of the school year. The interview tool is included in this PMP. The baseline year is 2012, the first application of annual survey.

Method of data acquisition by USAID: Quarterly and annual reports will contain results of the studies. Results will also be included in the PMP.

Frequency and timing of data acquisition by USAID: Annually

Estimated cost of data acquisition: Costs are covered by existing project resources.

Individual responsible at USAID: Mireya Batres- Program Management Specialist (Education)

Individual responsible for providing data to USAID: Margaret Kromhout- Chief of Party/Roger Sanchez- M&E Specialist

Location of Data Storage: MIDEH Project /SE files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: July 2012

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): TBD

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Surveys conducted in a sample of schools will document to what extent mothers and fathers engage in monitoring school and students' performance. Analysis of the survey results will help identify any obstacles to engagement for both women and men.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Analyze via comparison to baselines and targets, and considered in terms of implications towards project performance and achieving the assistance objective: e.g. With regards to gender equality, do men and women participate equally in monitoring school and student performance? What percentage of parents who monitor are also members of parent associations/groups?

Presentation of Data: Tables, graphs, and/or narrative explanations highlighting targets and actuals as well as disaggregation as noted above.

Review of Data: Annual review of data by MIDEH Project field and home office team

Reporting of Data: Annually

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline year is the year prior to the project start and the value is zero for a new program.

Other Notes: In the past MIDEH Project has anecdotally observed that men participate less frequently in monitoring school and student performance when compared to women. MIDEH Project plans to observe this phenomenon during the project and implement activities/initiatives towards achieving greater gender equality in this area. Data obtained in 2012 will be used as a baseline and targets will be set in accordance to this information.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	**Target**	**Actual**	**Notes**
2012		TBD	Baseline
2013	+5%		
2014	+5%		
2015	+5%		
2016	+5%		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 3/10/2012			

Annex 3: Monitoring Instruments

Indicator 12:

Procedimiento de Investigación
1) **Antes de comenzar la revisión favor leer al Maestro y/o Director de Escuela la introducción de este documento.**
2) **Pida al/la docente que le entregue lo siguiente: plan de clases, las pruebas formativas aplicadas a los/las alumnos/as, la tabla de resultados de las pruebas formativas aplicadas y la tabla de resultados de las pruebas diagnósticas.**
3) **Si no ha aplicado aun las pruebas formativas este año, pida las del año anterior.**
4) **Comenzar la revisión tomando en cuenta los criterios de evaluación que se encuentran en la Página 2.**

Introducción:
Esta investigación es parte del monitoreo del Proyecto MIDEH y tiene como finalidad conocer el uso de los materiales alineados al Diseño Curricular Nacional Básico (DCNB) en el aula. No es una evaluación sobre su trabajo. La participación es voluntaria, y usted/instituto puede dejar de participar en cualquier momento. Su cooperación aportará información muy valiosa para mejorar el sistema educativo en nuestro país, por lo que le pedimos su colaboración para proporcionarnos la información y materiales que a continuación le solicitamos. Toda la información que nos proporcione será estrictamente confidencial.

Uso del Material de apoyo al DCNB en el aula		
Fecha:		No. Encuesta:

Datos del Centro Educativo	
Nombre del Centro Educativo	
Colonia/Aldea/Caserío:	
Municipio:	
Departamento:	
Código del Centro Educativo	

Datos del Docente		
Edad del/la Docente(opcional)	18-24 años ☐ 25-34 ☐ 35-45 ☐ 45-54 ☐ 55-64 ☐ >65 ☐	Hombre ☐ Mujer ☐

A. Planificación de la clase		
Considerando el plan de clases solicitado al/la docente, verificar lo siguiente:		
1	Grado al que corresponde el plan de clases entregado por el/la docente:	
2	Plan de clases alineado con Estándares Educativos	Si ☐ No ☐
3	Plan de clases alineado con la Programación Educativa	Si ☐ No ☐

B. Pruebas Formativas Mensuales		
Con las pruebas formativas mensuales de los alumnos y la tabla de resultado solicitados al/la docente, verificar lo siguiente:		
4	Aplicación de las pruebas formativas mensuales	Si ☐ No ☐
5	Documentación sistemática de los resultados	Si ☐ No ☐

C. Pruebas Diagnósticas		
Con las pruebas diagnósticas de los alumnos y tabla de resultados solicitados al/la docente, verificar lo siguiente:		
6	Aplicación de las pruebas diagnósticas	Si ☐ No ☐
7	Documentación sistemática de los resultados	Si ☐ No ☐

_____   _____
Firma Investigador   **Firma Docente**

Criterios de Evaluación			
	Aspecto	**SI**	**NO**
2	Plan de clases alineado con Estándares Educativos	Plan de clases considera 1 o más de los Estándares Educativos establecidos.	Docente no muestra el plan de clases anual o el plan no corresponde a los estándares educativos definidos.
3	Plan de clases alineado con la Programación Educativa mensual	Plan de clases corresponde al mes y cubre 1 o más de los estándares y contenidos conceptuales y actitudinales definidos en la Programación.	Docente no muestra el plan de clases o el plan no corresponde a los estándares y contenidos conceptuales y actitudinales definidos en la Programación.
4	Aplicación de las pruebas formativas mensuales (recordar que la prueba que corresponde a los meses de febrero y marzo se aplican ambas de forma única en abril)	El docente ha administrado 1 o más pruebas formativas mensuales.	Docente no muestra los cuadernillos de aplicación de las pruebas formativas de cada alumno o no los ha aplicado.
5	Documentación sistemática de los resultados (pruebas formativas mensuales)	El docente ha tabulado los resultados para 1 o más de las pruebas formativas mensuales.	Docente no ha completado o no muestra la hoja de tabulación de resultados
6	Aplicación de las pruebas diagnósticas	El docente presenta las pruebas diagnósticas realizadas por los alumnos y/o la hoja de tabulación de resultados.	Docente no muestra las pruebas diagnósticas o la hoja de tabulación de resultados o no las ha aplicado.
7	Documentación sistemática de los resultados (pruebas diagnósticas)	La hoja de tabulación de resultados de la prueba incluye el total de respuestas correctas y/o el total/porcentaje por componente.	Docente no ha completado o no muestra la hoja de tabulación de resultados.

Indicator 13:

Introducción:
Esta encuesta es parte del monitoreo del Proyecto MIDEH. La participación es voluntaria, y usted puede dejar de participar en cualquier momento. También puede omitir preguntas si no desea contestarlas. Sus repuestas aportarán información muy valiosa para mejorar el sistema educativo en nuestro país. De antemano le damos gracias por su cooperación.
Toda la información que nos proporcione será estrictamente confidencial.

Uso de Resultados de Evaluación de Rendimientos y otros Indicadores Educativos: Encuesta a Líderes Locales	
Fecha:	Hombre ☐ Mujer ☐
Nombre del Encuestado:	
Nombre de la organización:	
Tipo de organización	☐ Sociedad Civil ☐ ONG ☐ Gobierno ☐ COMDE ☐ Asociación Padres de Familia ☐ Otro (especifique) _____
Colonia/Aldea/Caserío:	
Municipio:	
Departamento:	

	A. Uso de Resultados de Evaluación de Rendimientos y otros Indicadores Educativos en su Organización:	
1	¿Tiene su organización un plan o implementa actividades cuyo fin es mejorar la calidad de la educación? **(Si la respuesta es No, pase a la pregunta No.6)**	Si ☐ No ☐
2	¿En qué área está enfocada su plan/actividades?	_____ _____ _____
3	¿Usaron resultados de evaluación de rendimientos y/u otros indicadores educativos en la elaboración de este plan/actividades?	Si ☐ No ☐
4	¿Qué tipo de resultados de evaluación de rendimientos e indicadores educativos usaron?	☐A. Número de docentes por centro educativo ☐B. Tasa de repetición ☐C. Tasa de deserción ☐D. Tasa de cobertura (pre-básica, básica, media) ☐E. Días de clases ☐F. Matrícula por grado ☐G. Resultados de pruebas formativas mensuales ☐H. Informe anual de rendimiento académico departamental ☐I. Informe anual de rendimiento académico nacional ☐J. Infraestructura escolar ☐K. Otro (especifique): _____ _____
5	¿Cuál es el fin principal para su uso de los resultados de evaluación de rendimientos e indicadores educativos?	☐ A. Monitoreo del rendimiento de los docentes ☐ B. Monitoreo del desempeño estudiantil ☐ C. Elaborar Plan Operativo Anual (POA) a nivel local/municipal ☐ D. Elaborar Plan Estratégico Educativo Municipal (PEME) ☐ E. Comparar el rendimiento de su municipio o comunidad con los datos departamentales o nacionales ☐ F. Para influir en las políticas públicas y/o toma de decisiones a nivel local/municipal ☐ G. Para hacer incidencia sobre la calidad educativa ☐ H. Otro (especifique): _____ _____

6	¿Participo usted o alguien de su organización en algún Cabildo Abierto sobre el tema de Educación en su Municipalidad?	Si _____ No_____ Especifique cuantos: _____
7	¿Socializaron los resultados de evaluación de rendimientos y/u otros indicadores educativos en los Cabildos Abiertos?	Si _____ No_____
8	¿Presentaron un informe o socializaron los resultados de evaluación de rendimientos y/u otros indicadores educativos a los residentes de su municipalidad?	Si _____ No_____
9	¿Su organización ha usado los resultados de evaluación de rendimientos y otros indicadores educativos para exigir rendición de cuentas sobre la calidad educativa a instituciones/autoridades en su municipalidad?	Si _____ No_____
10	Si la respuesta de la pregunta 9 es **Sí,** marca las instituciones o grupos en el cuadro adjunto:	☐ A. Corporación Municipal ☐ B. Escuelas ☐ C. Docentes ☐ D. Asociación de Padres de Familia ☐ E. Representantes de Secretaría de Educación a nivel Departamental ☐ Dirección Distrital de Educación ☐ G. Otro (especifique): _____ _____
11	¿Han utilizado los resultados de evaluación de rendimientos y otros indicadores educativos para elaborar propuestas de mejoras educativas enmarcadas en el POA y/o Plan estratégico de su organización?	Si _____ No_____
12	¿Qué obstáculos ha encontrado para aprovechar los resultados de evaluación de rendimientos y otros indicadores educativos?	☐ A. Falta de acceso a información educativa ☐ B. Falta de capacidad para utilizar datos ☐ C. Falta de voluntad política de las autoridades ☐ D. Falta de socialización de datos educativos ☐ E. Otro (especifique): _____ _____
13	¿Usted considera que los resultados de evaluación de rendimientos y otros indicadores educativos son útiles para sus planes de incidencia o para influir en la toma de decisiones a nivel municipal?	Si _____ No_____ Especifique porque: _____ _____ _____
MUCHAS GRACIAS POR SU COLABORACIÓN		

_____   _____

      Firma Encuestador   **Firma Encuestado**

Indicator 14:

Introducción:
Esta encuesta es parte del monitoreo del Proyecto MIDEH. La participación es voluntaria, y usted puede dejar de participar en cualquier momento. También puede omitir preguntas si no desea contestarlas.
Sus repuestas aportarán información muy valiosa para mejorar el sistema educativo en nuestro país. Todas sus repuestas serán de carácter privado.

Encuesta a Padres de Familia o Encargados

Fecha:	Hombre ☐ Mujer ☐
No. Encuesta:	Estado Civil (opcional):
Nombre del Entrevistado:	
Nombre del Centro Educativo:	
Colonia/Aldea/Caserío	
Municipio:	
Departamento:	

I.   Monitoreo de los Centros Educativos

1	¿Es usted miembro de una asociación de padres de familia de la escuela?	Si ____ No____
2	¿Participa en sesiones de información para padres patrocinados por la escuela?	Si ____ No____
3	¿Utiliza la guía para padres de familia sobre los estándares educativos en español y matemáticas?	Si ____ No____
4	¿Quien de la familia participa en reuniones de la escuela con los docentes?	A. Padre B. Madre C. Ambos D. Otro (especifique): _____

II.   Monitoreo del Desempeño de los Estudiantes

5	¿Usted revisa los cuadernos y tareas asignados a sus hijos?	Si ____ No____
6	¿Conoce los resultados de las pruebas formativas mensuales y la prueba diagnóstica anual de sus hijos?	Si ____ No____
7	¿Quien de la familia participa en la supervisión del desempeño de su hijo/hija?	A. Padre B. Madre C. Ambos D. Otro (especifique) _____

MUCHAS GRACIAS POR SU COLABORACIÓN

_____   _____
Firma Encuestador (a)   **Firma Encuestado (a)**